DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 005 HE 012 962

TITLE	Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education, Part III.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Mar 80
NOTE	266p.: For related documents see ED 143 290 and ED 175 295. Best copy available.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education: *Affirmative Action: American Indians: College Students: Cost Effectiveness: Equal Education: Equal Opportunities (Jobs): *Ethnic Groups: *Higher Education: *Minority Groups: Resource Allocation: Selective Admission: Spanish Americans: Student Financial Aid: Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The effectiveness of institutional, state, and federal efforts to expand educational participation in California is examined in this third of a three-report series on equal opportunity in California postsecondary education. The purposes of this report are to: (1) review the progress made during the past five years, (2) identify the barriers to further progress, (3) inventory existing student affirmative action programs, and (4) provide recommendations for a coordinated statewide effort to increase the educational participation of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students. Chapters present statistical information and conclusions on such areas as: the participation of ethnic minorities and women in postsecondary education: barriers to expanded participation in postsecondary education: existing campus-based programs: "Special Action/Exception" admissions policies: student financial assistance programs: meeting the needs of students with dependent children: and recommendations for a coordinated statewide effort in student affirmative action. Several conclusions were reached, such as: the underrepresentation of Chicano students is particularly severe since they constitute the largest and the fastest-growing ethnic minority group in California; more coordination is needed between federal, state, and institutionally funded student affirmative action programs; and there is a general lack of formal cooperative efforts among postsecondary institutions in outreach programs designed to assist ethnic minority and low-income students in gaining access to postsecondary education. (LC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190005

march 1980

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

143 290
175 215

Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education

Part III

California
Postsecondary
Education
Commission

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Calif P.S.E. Comm.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 012 962

AUG 4 1980

California Postsecondary
Education Commission

Resolution 7-80

Approving Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part III

WHEREAS, Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 (Resolution Chapter 209, 1974) requested the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Governors of the California Community Colleges

> . . . to prepare a plan that will provide for addressing and overcoming, by 1980, ethnic, economic, and sexual underrepresentation in the make-up of the student bodies of institutions of public higher education as compared to the general ethnic, economic, and sexual composition of recent California high school graduates, and

WHEREAS, The California Postsecondary Education Commission was requested to report annually to the Legislature on the progress the public segments have made in addressing and responding to the problem; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the California Postsecondary Education Commission approve the report, Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part III, as its third response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151, and that the Commission authorize its Director to transmit the report to the Legislature, the Governor, and Board of Regents of the University of California, the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

Adopted
March 17, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction i

Chapter I: The Participation of Ethnic Minorities and Women in Postsecondary Education . . . 1

Ethnic Minorities 2

Enrollment 2
Distribution Among Academic Programs . . . 15
Persistence. 16

Women 23

Enrollment 23
Persistence. 25

Conclusions 29

Chapter II: Barriers to Expanded Participation of Ethnic Minorities and Women in California Postsecondary Education. . . . 32

Introduction. 32
California Public Schools 33

Desegregation. 33
Counseling and Teaching Staffs: A Lack of Role Models. 34
The Problem of Differential Achievement. 36

Postsecondary Institutions. 38

Admissions Criteria. 38
Student Services 40
Faculty and Staff: A need for Role Models and Staff Development 41
Curriculum 44

The Private Sector. 45

Public Policy Boards. 46

Conclusions 47

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Chapter III: Existing Campus-Based Programs 51

Federally Funded Programs 51

Upward Bound 52
Talent Search. 53
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students 53
Educational Opportunity Centers. 54
Community Service Program. 55
Education Information Centers. 56
Vocational Education Act 56
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) 58

Privately Funded Programs 59

State Funded Programs 61

Educational Opportunity Program. 61

Objectives and Program Components . . . 61
Major Differences Among Programs. . . . 63
Growth of EOP/S 64
Impact on Ethnic Minority Students. . . 68
Problems to be Resolved 71

The University's Partnership Program . . . 72
The University's Partners Program 75
The University's Immediate Outreach Program. 76
The University's Academic Enrichment Programs 76
State University's Three Pilot Projects 77
State University/Los Angeles Unified School District Program 78
Community College EOPS Student Summer Internship Program 79
California Student Opportunity and Access Program 79
School Improvement Program 80
Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics 81

Findings and Conclusions 82

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Chapter IV: "Special Action/Exception" Admissions Policies 90

University of California 90

California State University and Colleges . . . 93

Conclusions: Implications of the Special Admissions Programs 95

Chapter V: Intersegmental Consortia Designed to Increase the Enrollment of Ethnic Minorities, Women, and Low-Income Students. 98

Background Information 98

Current Status of Intersegmental Cooperation 101

Problems to be Resolved 106

Current and Future Plans 107

The Commission's Role and Recommendations for Improving Regional Coordination 108

Recent Developments 109

Conclusions 110

Chapter VI: Student Financial Assistance Programs. . 112

Federally Funded Student Assistance Programs 112

State Funded Student Assistance Programs. . . . 114

Institutionally Funded Student Assistance Programs 119

Ethnic, Sex, and Income Composition of Student Aid Recipients 119

Problems to be Resolved 124

Findings and Conclusions 125

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Chapter VII: Meeting the Educational Needs of the Limited-English and Non-English Speaking Persons in California 128

Introduction. 128

Population Trends 128

California's Changing Population and the Need for Bilingual Education. 133

LES/NES Students in the Public Schools. 133
Educational Needs of LES/NES Adults 134
Meeting the Educational Needs of LES/NES Students 135
Evaluations of Bilingual Education 141
The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. 145
Role of Postsecondary Institutions in Responding to the Needs of LES/NES Students 146
The Need for Cooperation in Bilingual Programs 152

Conclusions 156

Chapter VIII: Programs to Meet the Needs of Students With Dependent Children 159

Historical Perspective. 159

Child Development Programs in California. 162

Funding Child Development Programs in California 163

Who are the Recipients? 166

Campus Child Development Programs 168

The California Community Colleges. 168
The California State University and Colleges 170
The University of California 172

Conclusions 174

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Chapter IX: An Assessment of Existing Programs to Meet the Educational Needs of American Indian Students 176

Background 176

Existing Programs Responding to the Educational Needs of American Indians. . . . 180

Postsecondary Educational Problems Faced by American Indians. 183

Conclusions. 185

Chapter X: Student Affirmative Action Plans by the Three Public Segments of Postsecondary Education 187

University of California 187

Undergraduate Plan. 187
Graduate Plan 191

California State University and Colleges . . . 192

California Community Colleges. 197

An Assessment of Segmental Planning Efforts. 200

Findings and Conclusions 202

Chapter XI: Recommendations for a Coordinated Statewide Effort in Student Affirmative Action 213

Priorities in the Student Affirmative Action Effort. 214

Assessing the Participation Rate of Ethnic Minorities and Women in Postsecondary Education. 218

Addressing the Need for More Formal Cooperative Efforts. 220

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Chapter XI (Cont'd)

Addressing the Need for Efficient Use of Financial Resources 223

Student Affirmative Action as a Comprehensive Effort 225

  Special Action and Exception Admissions Programs 226
  Student Financial Assistance Programs. 227
  Programs to Meet the Needs of Students with Dependent Children. . . . 229
  Meeting the Educational Needs of the Limited-English and Non-English Speaking Persons in California. 230

Addressing the Need for Institutional Commitment to Student Affirmative Action 232

Addressing the Need for Improved Evaluation and Accountability 233

INTRODUCTION

Equal educational opportunity for all California citizens has been a goal of the State's public postsecondary institutions since at least 1964. During that fifteen-year period, a variety of programs have been established to increase enrollments and persistence rates of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students. A substantial financial commitment has been made by both the State and federal governments to these programs, with the general level of funding increasing each year.

Fifteen years have passed since the establishment of the first "educational opportunity program" at the University of California, and five years have elapsed since the passage of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151. It is now time for a thorough assessment of the effectiveness of institutional, State, and federal efforts to expand educational participation in California. The purposes of this report are to: (1) review the progress made during the past five years, (2) identify the barriers to further progress, (3) inventory existing student affirmative action programs, and (4) provide recommendations for a coordinated statewide effort to increase the educational participation of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students.

Recognizing the existence of underrepresented groups in California's postsecondary institutions, the Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 (1974). The Resolution requested the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, and the Governors of the California Community Colleges:

> To prepare a plan that will provide for addressing and overcoming, by 1980, ethnic, economic, and sexual underrepresentation in the make-up of the student bodies of institutions of public higher education as compared to the general ethnic, economic, and sexual composition of recent California high school graduates.

These plans were to be submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission by July 1, 1975, and the Commission in turn was to "integrate and transmit the plans to the Legislature with its comments."

In addition, ACR 151 requested the three public segments to report annually to the Commission on their progress toward the 1980 goal, with specific discussion of obstacles to the implementation of a statewide plan. These reports were to be integrated and transmitted to the Legislature by the Commission, together with its evaluations and recommendations.

The Commission has published two previous reports pursuant to ACR 151. The initial report, Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part I, (April 1976), contained three major conclusions:

- The student affirmative action plans prepared by the segments in 1975 do not provide an adequate basis on which to develop a coherent statewide plan to address and overcome the problem of underrepresentation, as requested by the Legislature in ACR 151. 1/

- Black and Spanish-surnamed students continue to be underrepresented in public postsecondary education, and, during 1973 and 1974, the degree of underrepresentation apparently increased, rather than decreased.

- Increased financial assistance should be provided for: (1) recruitment programs to increase the admissions-eligibility pool of underrepresented groups, and (2) expanded student-support services to promote successful educational experiences for those admitted to public postsecondary institutions.

The second report, published the following year, was entitled, Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part II (June 1977). It contained the following five conclusions:

- Despite considerable effort by the segments, there is no evidence to indicate that progress has been made in the past four years to increase the proportions of ethnic-minority enrollments in public postsecondary education. Chicano and Black students are still underrepresented, and since 1973 the degree of underrepresentation has apparently increased, both in the California Community Colleges and the University of California. Women are also underrepresented, particularly in the graduate programs of the University of California.

- One of the goals of ACR 151 is for the public segments to expand their enrollment of Black and Chicano/Latino students in order to adequately address and overcome, by 1980, ethnic underrepresentation in their student bodies. This goal will not be achieved.

- The lack of progress during the past four years in expanding the enrollment of ethnic minorities does not necessarily indicate a lack of commitment to the goal of equal educational participation by the public institutions. Several factors beyond the control of the institutions have limited their success. These factors include problems of unemployment and inflation, the extension of federally funded aid programs to students attending accredited private vocational/technical institutions, the high secondary-school drop-out rate for Chicano and Black students, the inadequate number of trained bilingual teachers, and the inadequate elementary- and secondary-school training received by many ethnic minorities from low-income communities.

- There is need for a cooperative approach by the three public segments, and the independent institution as well, to make further progress in the development and implementation of plans for equal educational participation.

- Chicano and Black students have had less opportunity than white students to participate in and benefit from public postsecondary education. Efforts to eliminate these inequalities must focus on several barriers to change, including inadequate elementary- and secondary-school education; low family income and the cost of a college education; frequently insensitive, and sometimes hostile, faculty and staff attitudes; social and cultural constraints; standardized admissions tests; and ineffective or inadequate student personnel services.

On the basis of the data and analysis presented in this third report, the Commission now offers the following conclusions concerning efforts to expand educational opportunities for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students:

- The goals of ACR 151 will not be achieved until a larger proportion of ethnic minority and low-income students (1) receive better academic training in grades K-12, and (2) graduate from high school. The postsecondary community has an obligation to work with the Department of Education and the elementary and secondary schools in efforts to increase and improve the academic motivation and preparation of ethnic minority and low-income students.

- While all of the ethnic minority groups considered in this report can be served more effectively by the State's public postsecondary institutions, the underrepresentation of Chicano students is particularly severe since they constitute the largest and the fastest-growing ethnic minority group in California.

- During recent years, there has been a substantial financial commitment by the federal and State governments to support programs designed to expand educational opportunities for ethnic minorities and low-income peoples. While additional financial resources can always be used to establish new and desirable programs, it is particularly imperative now that existing resources be used more effectively. Accordingly, there is a need for more extensive evaluations of student affirmative action programs in order to identify those strategies which have been either successful or unsuccessful in expanding educational opportunities for minority students.

- Many innovative student affirmative action programs have been implemented during the past few years designed both to improve the academic preparation of ethnic minority students enrolled in junior and senior high schools and to raise their aspirations to attend college. It can be expected that these programs will begin to have an impact on postsecondary enrollment levels by ethnic minority students during the next few years, as the program participants complete their final year of high school work.

- There is a general lack of formal cooperative efforts among postsecondary institutions in outreach programs designed to assist ethnic minority and low-income students gain access to postsecondary education.

- While there are a multitude of federal, State, and institutionally funded student affirmative action programs, there is inadequate coordination among them to ensure the effective use of available resources and the elimination of undesirable duplication.

- Most of the emphasis in existing student affirmative action programs has been placed on the recruitment of ethnic minorities into postsecondary institutions. There is a need to place an expanded emphasis on assisting nontraditional students in (1) transferring from two-year to four-year institutions, and (2) persisting in college through the completion of a baccalaureate, master's, and/or doctoral degree.

CHAPTER I

THE PARTICIPATION OF ETHNIC MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Enrollment is the primary indicator used in this report to assess the progress made in expanding educational opportunities; i.e., the extent to which members of traditionally underrepresented* groups enroll in and graduate from postsecondary institutions. While data regarding women in postsecondary education generally are adequate, an analysis of the participation of ethnic minorities is impeded by the limited availability and quality of data. The major problems in this area are the following:

1. The primary source of data on ethnicity is student self-identification. There are two weaknesses inherent in this method: (1) many students will not volunteer such information, and (2) there is no practical way of verifying the accuracy of student responses. As a result of the high nonresponse rate, some of the data on student ethnicity may exhibit statistically significant abnormalities. This problem is particularly important for data on American-Indian students, since there is no generally accepted definition of an "American Indian," and the data collection process does not include the identification of tribal affiliation and/or Bureau of Indian Affairs number. Consequently, data on American Indians tend to be inflated.

2. Ethnic classifications and definitions have been changed by the federal government from year to year. As a consequence, each segment has made at least one change in its categories for ethnic group data in the past five years.

3. Each segment of postsecondary education uses a different method to collect ethnicity data, and on many campuses the method has not been refined and routinized. As a result, the data do not provide a sound basis for comparisons among institutions and segments. For example, Fall 1978 enrollment data for the

---

*The method used to determine the degree of underrepresentation was discussed in Chapter 3 of Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part I. Briefly, the enrollment level of ethnic minorities and women in postsecondary education is compared to their Fall 1977 enrollment in California public schools. Underrepresentation of an ethnic minority group means that a smaller percent is enrolled in postsecondary education than was enrolled in elementary and secondary education in Fall 1977.

California State University and Colleges cannot be compared with the same data from previous years since some campuses adopted different methods for collecting ethnicity data, with a resulting change in the nonresponse rate.

4. The data necessary for a thorough analysis of the persistence of ethnic minorities and women are not available.

5. The ethnic classification of "Asian" is a broad category which includes students with Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Vietnamese, Samoan, and Filipino background. Therefore, generalizations about enrollment trends of "Asian Students" may be misleading and insensitive to the differing levels of participation by these several ethnic groups.

As a consequence of the limited availability and quality of data, there are inherent limitations in any assessment of the status of minorities in postsecondary education. The conclusions which are presented in this chapter can only be general, reflecting those limitations.

ETHNIC MINORITIES

Enrollment

Three indicators have been used to assess the current status of ethnic minority enrollments in postsecondary education:

- Trends in the participation and representation in each segment (both undergraduate and graduate levels) of the ethnic minority groups during the period Fall 1975 through Fall 1978.

- Representation Index* - an indicator of the representation of each ethnic minority group in postsecondary education as compared to their representation in public elementary and secondary schools.

*The Representation Index is determined by dividing the representation (percent) of a particular ethnic group at the postsecondary level by the representation (percent) of that same ethnic group at the elementary/secondary level. A ratio which is less than 1.0 indicates that the ethnic group is a smaller proportion of the student body at the postsecondary level than at the elementary/secondary level. A ratio which is more than 1.0 indicates the reverse.

- Distribution Index* - an indicator of the distribution of students by ethnic group among each of the segments of postsecondary education.

  *The Distribution Index is determined by dividing the representation (percent) of a particular ethnic group in a segment of postsecondary education by the representation (percent) of that same ethnic group in postsecondary education generally. This ratio indicates whether the representation of an ethnic group is higher (ratio greater than 1.0) or lower (ratio less than 1.0) in the segment than it is in postsecondary education generally.

Enrollment data for Fall 1978 (Table I-1) indicate that ethnic minorities constitute approximately 27 percent of undergraduate students and 17 percent of graduate students in California's degree-granting postsecondary institutions. In comparison, ethnic minorities constitute approximately 37 percent of the students enrolled in the State's elementary and secondary schools.

In comparison with their representation in both the State's population and the elementary and secondary schools, Chicanos and Blacks are underrepresented in postsecondary institutions. Black and Chicano students account for roughly 9 and 10 percent of the undergraduate enrollment, respectively, and roughly 5 percent each of the graduate enrollment. The underrepresentation of Chicano students is particularly severe since they constitute the largest and fastest-growing ethnic minority group in California. Asian students account for 6.6 percent of the undergraduate enrollment and 6.4 percent of the graduate enrollment. These figures compare favorably with their representation in both the State's population and the elementary and secondary schools.

Data concerning trends in the representation and distribution of American-Indian students in postsecondary institutions are provided in Table I-2. Because of the small size of this group and definitional difficulty, no generalizations can be made concerning the underrepresentation of American Indians. Compared to the enrollment pattern for all students in postsecondary education, the Distribution Index for American-Indian students shows a higher concentration of undergraduates in the California Community Colleges and a higher concentration of graduate students in the California State University and Colleges. There is no evidence of improvement in the representation of this group at either the undergraduate or the graduate level.

The participation and representation of Asian students have increased over the past four years in each of the four segments, on

TABLE I-1

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS
FALL 1978

		American Indian	Asian	Black	Chicano	White	Total Known Ethnicity	Total, All Students
California Community Colleges								
	Number Enrolled	12,751	48,354	81,724	98,306	620,678	861,813	983,685
	Percent	1.48	5.61	9.48	11.41	72.02		
	Representation Index	1.63	1.20	0.94	0.54	1.13		
	Distribution Index	1.10	0.85	1.09	1.10	0.99		
California State University and Colleges								
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	2,568	15,525	14,407	15,990	128,215	176,705	238,260
	Percent	1.45	8.79	8.15	9.05	72.56		
	Representation Index	1.59	1.87	0.81	0.43	1.14		
	Distribution Index	1.08	1.33	0.94	0.87	0.94		
Graduate	Number Enrolled	556	3,539	2,667	3,079	36,021	45,862	67,915
	Percent	1.21	7.72	5.82	6.71	78.54		
	Representation Index	1.33	1.65	0.58	0.32	1.24		
	Distribution Index	1.69	1.21	1.21	1.35	0.94		
University of California								
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	462	9,876	3,274	4,631	63,466	81,709	90,961
	Percent	0.57	12.09	4.01	5.67	77.67		
	Representation Index	0.63	2.58	0.40	0.27	1.22		
	Distribution Index	0.42	1.83	0.46	0.55	1.06		
Graduate	Number Enrolled	134	1,963	1,036	1,379	21,562	26,094	36,920
	Percent	0.51	7.52	4.05	5.29	82.63		
	Representation Index	0.56	1.60	0.40	0.25	1.30		
	Distribution Index	0.71	1.18	0.85	1.06	0.99		
Independent Institutions								
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	495	6,466	6,479	6,740	71,910	92,090	104,666
	Percent	0.54	7.02	7.04	7.32	78.09		
	Representation Index	0.60	1.50	0.70	0.35	1.23		
	Distribution Index	0.40	1.07	0.79	0.70	1.07		
Graduate	Number Enrolled	320	3,453	3,012	2,540	59,246	68,571	75,363
	Percent	0.47	5.04	4.39	3.70	86.40		
	Representation Index	0.52	1.07	0.44	0.18	1.36		
	Distribution Index	0.65	0.79	0.91	0.74	1.04		
All Degree-Granting Institutions								
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	16,276	80,221	105,884	125,667	884,269	1,212,317	1,417,572
	Percent	1.34	6.62	8.73	10.36	72.94		
	Representation Index	1.48	1.41	0.87	0.50	1.15		
Graduate	Number Enrolled	1,010	8,955	6,735	6,998	116,829	140,527	180,198
	Percent	0.72	6.37	4.79	4.98	83.14		
	Representation Index	0.80	1.36	0.48	0.24	1.31		

TABLE I-2

PARTICIPATION, REPRESENTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS FALL 1975 TO FALL 1978

		Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978
California Community Colleges					
	Number Enrolled	11,141	15,118	13,027	12,751
	Percent		1.63	1.50	1.48
	Distribution Index		1.11	1.10	1.10
California State University and Colleges					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	3,150	2,312	2,121	2,368
	Percent	1.75	1.30	1.28	1.45
	Distribution Index		0.89	0.94	1.08
Graduate	Number Enrolled	664	591	497	556
	Percent	1.34	1.20	1.09	1.21
	Distribution Index		1.59	1.37	1.69
Total	Number Enrolled	3,814	2,903	2,618	3,124
	Percent	1.66	1.28	1.24	1.40
	Distribution Index		0.92	0.95	1.10
University of California					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	443	438	448	462
	Percent	0.53	0.54	0.56	0.56
	Distribution Index		0.37	0.41	0.42
Graduate	Number Enrolled	145	165	134	134
	Percent	0.49	0.60	0.51	0.51
	Distribution Index		0.79	0.63	0.71
Total	Number Enrolled	588	603	582	596
	Percent		0.56	0.54	0.55
	Distribution Index		0.40	0.42	0.43
Independent Institutions					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled		753	573	495
	Percent		0.90	0.76	0.54
	Distribution Index		0.62	0.56	0.40
Graduate	Number Enrolled		222	401	320
	Percent		0.42	0.70	0.47
	Distribution Index		0.56	0.67	0.65
Total	Number Enrolled		975	974	815
	Percent		0.72	0.74	0.51
	Distribution Index		0.51	0.56	0.40
Combined					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled		18,621	16,169	16,276
	Percent		1.47	1.36	1.34
Graduate	Number Enrolled		978	1,032	1,010
	Percent		0.76	0.80	0.72
Total	Number Enrolled		19,399	17,201	17,286
	Percent		1.40	1.31	1.28

both the undergraduate and graduate levels (see Table I-3). Compared with their enrollments in the State's elementary and secondary schools, Asian students are not underrepresented in postsecondary education. Unlike any other ethnic minority group studied, the Distribution Index does not show a higher concentration of Asian undergraduate students in the Community Colleges, compared to the enrollment pattern for all students in postsecondary education. In fact, the Asian undergraduate is more than twice as likely to be enrolled in the University of California than in the Community Colleges. At the graduate level, Asian students enroll with about equal frequency in the State University as in the University. Asian students enroll in graduate education in the independent sector at approximately half the rate found in the public sector.

There is no evidence to indicate that the overall participation and representation of Black students have improved during the period from Fall 1975 through Fall 1978. (See Table I-4.) For example, while the University has experienced a decrease in the participation and representation of Black students, the State University has shown a pattern of modest growth in both undergraduate and graduate Black enrollments. Compared with their enrollments in the State's elementary and secondary schools, Black students are underrepresented at the undergraduate level at each of the four-year segments, and at the graduate level in the University and the independent sector. Compared to the enrollment pattern for all students in postsecondary education, the Distribution Index for Black undergraduates shows a higher than average concentration in the Community Colleges, with an extremely low representation in the University. On the graduate level, there is a higher concentration of Blacks in the State University, but an extremely low representation in the University. The independent sector has demonstrated a steady increase in the number of students who identified themselves as Black over the past three years.

The overall participation and representation of Chicano students in postsecondary education have increased over the past several years (Table I-5), but these increases have not kept pace with the growth of the Chicano population in California. At the undergraduate level, all of the segments have experienced an increase in the number and percent of Chicano students enrolled during the period from Fall 1975 through Fall 1978. At the graduate level, the State University and the independent institutions have experienced the same trend. Significantly, however, compared with their enrollments in the State's elementary and secondary schools, Chicano students are substantially underrepresented in all segments and at all levels of postsecondary education.

The Distribution Index shows a higher than average concentration of Chicano undergraduate students in the Community Colleges and Chicano

TABLE I-3

PARTICIPATION, REPRESENTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ASIAN STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS
FALL 1975 TO FALL 1978

		Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978
California Community Colleges					
	Number Enrolled	36,766	41,364	45,238	48,354
	Percent		4.47	5.21	5.61
	Distribution Index		0.85	0.86	0.85
California State University and Colleges					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	10,723	12,779	12,927	15,525
	Percent	5.96	7.21	7.81	8.79
	Distribution Index		1.37	1.29	1.33
Graduate	Number Enrolled	3,013	3,485	3,208	3,539
	Percent	6.06	7.08	7.06	7.72
	Distribution Index		1.25	1.35	1.21
Total	Number Enrolled	13,736	16,264	16,135	19,064
	Percent	5.98	7.18	7.65	8.57
	Distribution Index		1.36	1.27	1.30
University of California					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	8,182	8,587	9,222	9,876
	Percent	9.79	10.64	11.49	12.09
	Distribution Index		2.03	1.89	1.83
Graduate	Number Enrolled	1,883	1,930	1,939	1,963
	Percent	6.35	7.01	7.33	7.52
	Distribution Index		1.23	1.40	1.18
Total	Number Enrolled	1,006	1,052	1,116	1,184
	Percent	8.89	9.72	10.46	10.98
	Distribution Index		1.84	1.73	1.67
Independent Institutions					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled		3,692	4,716	6,466
	Percent		4.43	6.27	7.05
	Distribution Index		0.84	1.03	1.07
Graduate	Number Enrolled		1,933	2,451	3,453
	Percent		3.67	4.29	5.04
	Distribution Index		0.50	0.62	0.79
Total	Number Enrolled		5,625	7,167	9,919
	Percent		4.13	5.41	6.19
	Distribution Index		0.78	0.90	0.94
Combined					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled		66,622	72,103	80,221
	Percent		5.24	6.07	6.62
Graduate	Number Enrolled		7,348	7,598	8,955
	Percent		5.68	5.22	
Total	Number Enrolled				
	Percent				

TABLE I-4

PARTICIPATION, REPRESENTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF BLACK STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS FALL 1975 TO FALL 1978

		Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978
California Community Colleges					
	Number Enrolled	84,674	88,586	88,000	81,724
	Percent		9.53	10.14	9.48
	Distribution Index		1.10	1.10	1.09
California State University and Colleges					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	12,584	12,850	12,007	14,407
	Percent	6.99	7.25	7.26	8.15
	Distribution Index		0.84	0.79	0.94
Graduate	Number Enrolled	2,543	2,584	2,400	2,667
	Percent	5.11	5.25	5.28	5.82
	Distribution Index		1.08	1.11	1.21
Total	Number Enrolled	15,127	15,434	14,407	17,074
	Percent	6.58	6.81	6.83	7.67
	Distribution Index		0.82	0.78	0.92
University of California					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled	3,472	3,355	3,343	3,274
	Percent	4.16	4.16	4.17	4.01
	Distribution Index		0.48	0.45	0.46
Graduate	Number Enrolled	1,312	1,235	1,157	1,056
	Percent	4.42	4.49	4.37	4.05
	Distribution Index		0.94	0.92	0.85
Total	Number Enrolled	4,784	4,590	4,500	4,330
	Percent	4.23	4.24	4.22	4.02
	Distribution Index		0.51	0.48	0.48
Independent Institutions					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled		5,156	5,691	6,479
	Percent		6.18	7.60	7.04
	Distribution Index		0.71	0.83	0.79
Graduate	Number Enrolled		2,336	2,483	3,012
	Percent		4.44	4.36	4.39
	Distribution Index		0.93	0.92	0.91
Total	Number Enrolled		7,492	8,174	9,491
	Percent		5.51	6.11	5.85
	Distribution Index		0.66	0.72	0.70
Combined					
Undergraduate	Number Enrolled		109,947	109,041	105,884
	Percent		8.65	9.17	8.73
Graduate	Number Enrolled		6,155	6,040	6,735
	Percent		4.79	4.68	4.79
Total	Number Enrolled		116,102	115,081	112,619
	Percent		8.29	8.73	8.32

TABLE I-5

PARTICIPATION, REPRESENTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF CHICANO STUDENTS IN POSTSECONDARY DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS FALL 1975 TO FALL 1978

		Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978
California Community Colleges					
	Number Enrolled	88,017	94,367	87,621	98,306
	Percent		10.15	10.10	11.41
	Distribution Index		1.09	1.08	1.10
California State University and Colleges					
Under-graduate	Number Enrolled	13,677	13,924	13,542	15,990
	Percent	7.60	7.85	8.18	9.05
	Distribution Index		0.85	0.87	0.87
Graduate	Number Enrolled	2,643	2,829	2,728	3,079
	Percent	5.32	5.75	6.01	6.71
	Distribution Index		1.23	1.26	1.35
Total	Number Enrolled	16,320	16,753	16,270	19,069
	Percent	7.10	7.40	7.72	8.57
	Distribution Index		0.83	0.86	0.87
University of California					
Under-graduate	Number Enrolled	4,155	4,351	4,468	4,631
	Percent	4.97	5.39	5.57	5.67
	Distribution Index		0.58	0.59	0.55
Graduate	Number Enrolled	1,443	1,456	1,414	1,379
	Percent	4.86	5.29	5.34	5.28
	Distribution Index		1.13	1.12	1.06
Total	Number Enrolled	5,598	5,807	5,882	6,010
	Percent	4.94	5.37	5.51	5.58
	Distribution Index		0.61	0.62	0.57
Independent Institutions					
Under-graduate	Number Enrolled		5,315	5,934	6,740
	Percent		6.37	7.93	7.32
	Distribution Index		0.69	0.84	0.70
Graduate	Number Enrolled		1,776	2,001	2,540
	Percent		3.37	3.52	3.70
	Distribution Index		0.72	0.74	0.74
Total	Number Enrolled		7,091	7,935	9,280
	Percent		5.16	5.93	5.72
	Distribution Index		0.58	0.66	0.58
Combined					
Under-graduate	Number Enrolled		117,957	111,565	125,667
	Percent		9.28	9.39	10.36
Graduate	Number Enrolled		6,061	6,143	6,998
	Percent		4.68	4.76	4.98
Total	Number Enrolled		124,018	117,708	132,665
	Percent		8.86	3.93	9.81

graduate students in the State University, compared to the enrollment pattern for all students in postsecondary education. The extremely low Chicano undergraduate enrollment (proportionately) in the University is only slightly less pronounced than the previously observed deficit in Black undergraduate enrollment in that segment. The University appears to be enrolling a slowly diminishing share of the Chicano enrollment (undergraduate and graduate) in postsecondary education. Viewed against the backdrop of the growth in the State's Chicano population, the picture of overall progress displayed in Table I-5 is illusory.

Within each segment of postsecondary education, there is considerable variation in the level of minority enrollments on each campus. Some campuses within each segment have a substantially higher number of Chicano, Black, and Asian students than either the segment as a whole or most of the other campuses within that segment. There are a variety of factors which account for this situation, including different programmatic emphases among the campuses and different proximities to ethnic minority communities. In the University, there is considerable variation among the nine campuses, as illustrated by the following. (See Table I-6.)

- The Berkeley and the Los Angeles campuses have the highest levels of Asian enrollment. This is particularly true at Berkeley, where 23 percent of full-time freshmen are Asian.
- At the undergraduate level, the Riverside and Irvine campuses have the highest enrollments of Chicano students, while on the graduate level, the Santa Barbara and Riverside campuses have the highest Chicano enrollments.
- At the undergraduate level, the Riverside and Los Angeles campuses have the highest enrollments of Black students, while on the graduate level, the Los Angeles and San Francisco Medical Center campuses have the highest enrollments of Black students.

Within the State University system, some campuses reported a high nonresponse rate by students asked to identify their ethnicity. Nevertheless, there is considerable variation among State University campuses in the reported levels of ethnic minority enrollments. (See Table I-7.)

- The Los Angeles and the San Francisco campuses have the highest enrollments of Asian students. This is particularly true at the Los Angeles campus, where 30 percent of full-time freshmen and 17 percent of all students are Asian.
- The Dominguez Hills, Los Angeles and Hayward campuses have the highest enrollments of Black students.

TABLE I-6

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ETHNIC MINORITY ENROLLMENT LEVEL PERCENT OF ALL STUDENTS, BY CAMPUS, BY ETHNICITY--FALL 1978

Asian Students

Berkeley	15.4%
San Francisco Medical Center	11.9
Los Angeles	11.7
U.C. SYSTEMWIDE	10.1
Irvine	9.1
Davis	8.2
San Diego	6.3
Riverside	5.2
Santa Barbara	4.5
Santa Cruz	3.1

Chicano Students

Riverside	8.4%
Irvine	8.4
Los Angeles	6.6
Santa Barbara	6.5
Santa Cruz	6.4
San Diego	5.8
San Francisco Medical Center	5.8
U.C. SYSTEMWIDE	5.6
Berkeley	3.8
Davis	3.5

Black Students

Riverside	6.0%
Los Angeles	5.3
San Francisco Medical Center	5.2
Irvine	4.8
San Diego	4.1
U.C. SYSTEMWIDE	4.0
Berkeley	3.8
Davis	2.8
Santa Cruz	2.5
Santa Barbara	2.1

TABLE I-7

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES ETHNIC MINORITY ENROLLMENT LEVEL PERCENT OF ALL STUDENTS, BY CAMPUS, BY ETHNICITY--FALL 1978

Asian Students

Los Angeles	17.7%	San Luis Obispo	4.0%
San Francisco	14.7	Fullerton	3.8
San Jose	10.0	San Diego	3.3
Long Beach	8.9	Stanislaus	2.5
CSUC SYSTEMWIDE	7.4	Humboldt	2.4
Sacramento	7.2	Bakersfield	2.0
Northridge	7.2	Sonoma	1.9
Hayward	6.9	Chico	1.8
Fresno	5.7	San Bernardino	1.8
Pomona	5.6		

Chicano Students

Los Angeles	20.2%	Northridge	8.2%
San Bernardino	14.5	Long Beach	7.7
Fresno	11.8	Dominguez Hills	6.7
Bakersfield	10.8	San Francisco	5.9
Pomona	9.9	Hayward	5.8
Stanislaus	9.9	Sacramento	5.6
San Jose	9.1	Sonoma	4.2
San Diego	8.8	Chico	4.0
Fullerton	8.6	San Luis Obispo	3.3
CSUC SYSTEMWIDE	8.6	Humboldt	2.4

Black Students

Dominguez Hills	37.1%	Sacramento	6.4%
Los Angeles	15.5	Stanislaus	4.9
Hayward	14.1	San Diego	4.4
San Bernardino	11.7	Fresno	3.9
San Francisco	9.7	Pomona	3.9
Long Beach	8.5	Sonoma	3.2
San Jose	8.3	Fullerton	3.1
CSUC SYSTEMWIDE	7.7	Chico	2.4
Northridge	6.8	San Luis Obispo	1.8
Bakersfield	6.6	Humboldt	.7

- The Los Angeles, San Bernardino, Fresno, and Bakersfield campuses have the highest enrollments of Chicano students. This is particularly true at the Los Angeles campus, where 31 percent of full-time freshmen and 19.4 percent of all students are Chicano.

California's independent colleges and universities also demonstrate considerable variation in enrollment levels of minority students. (See Table I-8.) Whittier College, University of La Verne, Mount St. Mary's College, Loyola Marymount University, and the University of Southern California have the highest proportions of ethnic minorities in their student bodies. Other enrollment levels of particular significance are the following:

- California Institute of Technology and the University of Southern California have the highest enrollments of Asian students.
- Pepperdine University and Mills College have the highest enrollments of Black students.
- Whittier College, University of La Verne, Mount St. Mary's College, and Loyola Marymount University have the highest enrollments of Chicano students.
- Pacific Union College, Claremont Men's College, the University of San Diego, and Harvey Mudd College have the highest enrollments of white students.

Among the Community Colleges, there is considerable variation in enrollment levels of ethnic minority students, which generally reflects the ethnic composition of the local district. (See Table B-32, Appendix B.) Los Angeles Southwest College and Compton Community College have an almost totally nonwhite student body, while Lake Tahoe Community College and Columbia Junior College have almost no ethnic minorities enrolled. Other enrollment levels of significance are:

- City College of San Francisco (28.9%), Los Angeles City College (19.2%), and Los Angeles Harbor College (13.5%) have the highest enrollments of Asian students.
- Los Angeles Southwest College and Compton College are essentially Black Community Colleges, with enrollments of 95.3 percent and 89.7 percent, respectively. The student bodies at West Los Angeles College and Los Angeles Trade-Technical College are also more than 50 percent Black.

TABLE I-8

INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS ETHNIC MINORITY ENROLLMENT LEVEL PERCENT OF ALL STUDENTS, BY CAMPUS, BY ETHNICITY FALL 1977

Asian Students

California Institute of Technology	13.1%
University of Southern California	10.8
Harvey Mudd College	9.0
Loma Linda University	9.0
Mills College	8.6
Occidental College	7.3
Pacific Union College	6.3
Mount St. Mary's College	5.6
INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS SYSTEMWIDE	5.4
Chapman College	5.3
Claremont Men's College	5.1
Stanford University	5.0
Loyola Marymount University	4.3
Pepperdine University	4.2
Whittier College	4.2
Scripps College	3.9
University of Redlands	3.6
Pitzer College	3.1
University of San Diego	2.5
La Verne College	2.1
St. Mary's College	2.1

Black Students

Pepperdine University	11.5%
Mills College	9.3
University of Redlands	8.4
La Verne College	8.2
Chapman College	8.0
Pitzer College	7.9
Loyola Marymount University	7.6
Loma Linda University	7.4
University of Southern California	6.7
St. Mary's College	6.5
INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS SYSTEMWIDE	6.3
Whittier College	5.9
Occidental College	5.6
Mount St. Mary's College	5.4
Scripps College	5.0
Stanford University	4.9
Claremont Men's College	3.1
University of San Diego	2.9
Pacific Union College	2.0
California Institute of Technology	1.2
Harvey Mudd College	0.4

Chicano Students

Whittier College	15.1%
La Verne College	14.5
Mount St. Mary's College	13.6
Loyola Marymount University	12.3
Pitzer College	7.2
University of San Diego	6.8
University of Southern California	6.4
INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS SYSTEMWIDE	6.0%
Loma Linda University	5.9
Occidental College	5.8
St. Mary's College	5.3
Stanford University	5.1
Scripps College	4.7
University of Redlands	4.3
Mills College	4.2
Claremont Men's College	4.2
Chapman College	4.0
Harvey Mudd College	3.7
Pacific Union College	2.9
Pepperdine University	2.8
California Institute of Technology	2.6

White Students

Pacific Union College	87.9%
Claremont Men's College	87.4
University of San Diego	87.3
Harvey Mudd College	86.9
Scripps College	86.4
St. Mary's College	86.0
Stanford University	84.4
California Institute of Technology	82.9
University of Redlands	82.9%
Pitzer College	81.8
INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS SYSTEMWIDE	81.6
Occidental College	81.0
Pepperdine University	79.7
Loma Linda University	77.5
Mills College	77.3
University of Southern California	75.4
Loyola Marymount University	75.1
Mount St. Mary's College	74.9
La Verne College	74.3
Whittier College	74.1

- East Los Angeles College has the highest enrollment of Chicano students--more than 65 percent of the student body. Other Community Colleges with high enrollments of Chicano students are Imperial Valley College, Los Angeles Mission College, and Rio Hondo College.

- De Anza College has the highest reported enrollment of American-Indian students--6.6 percent of the student body in Fall 1977. Other Community Colleges with high enrollments of American Indians are Mendocino College, Los Angeles Mission College, and College of the Redwoods.

Distribution Among Academic Programs

There are two methods of assessing the distribution of ethnic minorities among academic programs. The first is to identify the academic programs with the highest number of students enrolled by ethnic group. This approach identifies the most popular academic programs within each of the five ethnic student categories in this study. The second method is to examine each academic program to determine the ethnic distribution of students within that program. The ethnic distribution on a program-by-program basis can then be compared with the distribution within the institution as a whole. This method identifies those academic programs in which ethnic minorities are underrepresented.

The most popular academic programs for ethnic minorities, as judged by enrollments, are generally the same as those for white students. In the University, for example, American-Indian, Black, Chicano, and white students are most likely to enroll in the following undergraduate programs: biology, political science and government, sociology, history, English, and economics. (See Table B-7, Appendix B.) Asian students and nonresident aliens provide the only exceptions to this pattern, as they are more likely to select programs in engineering, as well as biology and economics. At the graduate level, a similar pattern exists, with each of the ethnic groups selecting as the most popular academic programs: medicine (M.D. degree), law, education, and business management/administration.

At the undergraduate level in the State University, the most popular academic programs for each of the ethnic groups include business and commerce, general liberal arts and sciences, psychology, and biology. (See Table B-16, Appendix B.) With the exception of Asian students, each ethnic group also had high enrollments in physical education. Despite these general similarities, there are some important differences in the selection of academic programs by ethnic minority groups. One of the most popular programs for Chicano students is Spanish, while a large number of the Black students enroll in social work and helping services, and in nursing. Accounting is a popular academic program for Asian, Chicano, and white students. Law enforcement and corrections is a popular academic program for Black, Chicano, and American-Indian students.

While there is considerable similarity in the most popular academic programs among ethnic groups, there is a great variability in the ethnic distribution of students among each of the academic programs. Chicano, Black, and American-Indian students tend to enroll in the social sciences and the humanities rather than in the more scientific and mathematically oriented disciplines. By contrast, Asian and white students tend to enroll in the latter disciplines rather than the social sciences. For example, at the University in Fall 1977, the disciplines with the highest enrollments of Chicano and Black students were (1) area studies, (2) law, (3) social studies, and (4) public affairs and services. (See Table I-9.) At the State University, the disciplines with the highest enrollments of Chicano and Black students were (1) public affairs and services, and (2) social sciences. (See Table I-10.) Chicano students also had high enrollments in (1) area studies, (2) foreign languages, and (3) interdisciplinary studies. In contrast, the academic disciplines with low proportional enrollment levels of Chicano and Black students were (1) agriculture and natural resources, (2) biological sciences, (3) computer and information systems, (4) mathematics, (5) physical sciences, and (6) engineering.

While Chicano, Black, and American-Indian students have a proportionately low enrollment in the scientific and mathematically oriented disciplines, Asian and white students have a proportionately high enrollment. In both the University and the State University, Asian students have high enrollments in (1) biological sciences, (2) computer and information sciences, (3) engineering, and (4) mathematics. Similarly, white students have high enrollments in (1) agriculture and natural resources, (2) communications, (3) fine and applied arts, (4) letters, (5) computer and information sciences, and (6) physical sciences.

Persistence

While the comprehensive data necessary for a thorough analysis of the persistence of ethnic minorities in college are not available, preliminary generalizations can be made on the basis of several "indicators." These indicators reveal that ethnic minority students are less likely to persist in college, and complete their college program in a timely fashion, than are white students.

TABLE I-9

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
FALL 1977

High Proportional Enrollment Levels for:

Chicano Students	Black Students	Asian Students	White Students
Area Studies	Area Studies	Architecture and Environmental Design	Agriculture and Natural Resources
Foreign Languages	Law	Biological Sciences	Communications
Law	Social Sciences	Computer and Information Sciences	Fine and Applied Arts
Social Sciences	Public Affairs & Services	Engineering	Home Economics
Public Affairs and Services		Mathematics	Letters
		Public Affairs and Services	Physical Sciences
			Business and Management
			Computer and Information Sciences

Low Proportional Enrollment Levels for:

Chicano Students	Black Students	Asian Students	White Students
Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture and Natural Resources	Education	Area Studies
Business and Management	Biological Sciences	Fine and Applied Arts	Public Affairs and Services
Computer and Information Sciences	Business and Management	Foreign Languages	Law
Engineering	Computer and Information Sciences	Law	
Mathematics	Engineering	Letters	
Physical Sciences	Home Economics	Physical Sciences	
	Mathematics	Social Sciences	
	Physical Sciences	Psychology	

TABLE I-10

DISTRIBUTION WITHIN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
FALL 1977

High Proportional Enrollment Levels for:

Chicano Students	Black Students	Asian Students	White Students
Area Studies	Public Affairs and Services	Biological Sciences	Agriculture and Natural Resources
Foreign Languages	Social Sciences	Business and Management	Architecture and Environmental Design
Public Affairs and Services		Computer and Information Sciences	Biological Sciences
Social Sciences		Engineering	Communications
Interdisciplinary Studies		Mathematics	Computer and Information Sciences
			Engineering
			Fine and Applied Arts
			Home Economics
			Letters
			Physical Sciences

Low Proportional Enrollment Levels for:

Chicano Students	Black Students	Asian Students	White Students
Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture and Natural Resources	Agriculture and Natural Resources	Foreign Languages
Architecture and Environmental Design	Architecture and Environmental Design	Area Studies	Public Affairs and Services
Biological Sciences	Area Studies	Communications	Social Sciences
Computer and Information Sciences	Biological Sciences	Letters	
Health Professions	Computer and Information Sciences	Social Science	
Home Economics	Engineering	Interdisciplinary Studies	
Letters	Fine and Applied Arts	Psychology	
Mathematics	Foreign Languages	Public Affairs and Services	
Physical Sciences	Letters		
	Physical Sciences		

For example, a recently completed study of the records of approximately 22,000 first-time freshmen who entered the State University in Fall 1973 reported that "graduation rates of minority students, in general, run significantly behind those for white non-Hispanic students." 1/ While 34 percent of the white freshmen who entered in Fall 1973 graduated with a baccalaureate degree within five years, only 14 percent of the Black, 15 percent of the Chicano, and 19 percent of the American-Indian students did so.

TABLE I-11

FIVE-YEAR GRADUATION RATES* (THROUGH JUNE 1978) of CSUC FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN ADMITTED IN FALL 1973
(By Ethnic Group)

Ethnic Group	Enrolled Fall 1973	Graduation Rates Male	Graduation Rates Female	Graduation Rates Total
American Indian	155	.160	.229	.192
Asian	971	.274	.387	.336
Black, Non-Hispanic	1,096	.102	.162	.138
Mexican American	1,102	.124	.184	.154
Other Hispanic	141	.170	.230	.197
Pacific Islanders	128	.225	.302	.264
White, Non-Hispanic	11,236	.310	.369	.342
Other Groups	323	.279	.277	.278
No Response	6,914	.249	.280	.265
Totals, All Ethnic Groups	22,066	.266	.320	.296

---

*Graduating within the system.

Note: Filipino students not separately identified in 1973.

Source: Those Who Stay -- Phase II: Student Continuance in the California State University and Colleges, The California State University and Colleges, May 1979, p. 13.

A second useful indicator of persistence is the relationship between degrees conferred and upper division enrollment. It is obtained by dividing the three-year average of baccalaureate degrees awarded to a particular ethnic group by their average upper division enrollment over the same three years.

Table I-12 indicates that ethnic minority students received 18.42 percent of the bachelor's degrees awarded by the State University between 1976 and 1978, and 16.57 percent of those awarded by the University during the same period. In addition, ethnic minorities received 17.48 percent of the master's degrees awarded by the State University, and 14.19 percent of those awarded by the University during the same three years. Ethnic minorities also received 9.28 percent of the doctoral degrees awarded by the University of California. (See Appendix B.)

Table I-12 also reveals that the persistence level of each ethnic group was below that of all students in both the State University and the University. It further shows that the ratio of degrees conferred to upper division enrollment is consistently lower for Chicano and Filipino students, but consistently higher for white and Asian students. It is interesting to note that while American Indians have a fairly low persistence rate in the University, it is considerably higher in the State University. Conversely, while Blacks have a fairly low persistence rate in the State University, it is considerably higher in the University.

There is a third indicator of the difficulties ethnic minorities have in completing an undergraduate program in a timely fashion. While all ethnic groups have about the same average age upon entering college as first-time freshmen, by the upper division level, Chicano, Black and American-Indian students are, on the average, two years older than their white counterparts. In Fall 1977, the average age for full-time, first-time freshmen at the University was 18.1 years. The average age for each ethnic group was also 18.1 years. The average age for full-time, upper division students was 22.4 years. While full-time, upper division white students were slightly younger (22.3 years), Chicano students were approximately one year older, Black students were two years older, and American-Indian students were 2.6 years older than all students generally.

A similar age pattern was found at the State University. The average age for full-time, first-time freshmen was 18.4 years. White, Black, and Asian students were slightly younger than the average while American-Indian and Chicano students were slightly older. By the upper division level, Black, American-Indian, and Chicano students were one to two years older than their white and Asian counterparts. For example, the average age of upper division Black students was 26.6 years, while the average age of Asian students was 23.0 years.

The pattern of unequal persistence is also demonstrated by the changing ethnic minority distribution by class level. For example, at the State University in Fall 1977, each ethnic minority group was a smaller proportion of the senior class than it was of the freshman class. (See Table I-13.) To illustrate, Black students represented

TABLE I-12

CSUC AND UC DEGREES CONFERRED BY KNOWN ETHNICITY 1976-78

California State University and Colleges	1976	1977	1978	Persistence Index
American Indian				
Bachelors	513 (1.45)	390 (1.14)	408 (1.19)	.2867
Masters	73 (1.06)	69 (1.09)	76 (1.12)	
Asian				
Bachelors	2,107 (5.94)	2,043 (5.98)	2,122 (6.18)	.2728
Masters	372 (5.42)	395 (6.23)	373 (5.52)	
Black				
Bachelors	1,766 (4.98)	1,645 (4.82)	1,656 (4.82)	.2284
Masters	417 (6.07)	353 (5.57)	374 (5.53)	
Chicano				
Bachelors	2,063 (5.81)	1,936 (5.67)	2,150 (6.26)	.2275
Masters	292 (4.25)	317 (5.00)	327 (4.84)	
Filipino				
Bachelors	67 (.19)	124 (.36)	160 (.47)	.1362
Masters	6 (.09)	20 (.32)	25 (.37)	
White				
Bachelors	28,981 (81.64)	28,003 (82.02)	27,847 (81.08)	.3275
Masters	5,705 (83.10)	5,185 (81.80)	5,583 (82.61)	
Total Bachelors	35,497	34,141	34,343	.3073
Total Masters	6,865	6,339	6,758	
University of California				
American Indian				
Bachelors	83 (.43)	91 (.48)	91 (.50)	.3393
Masters	24 (.52)	27 (.59)	25 (.59)	
Asian				
Bachelors	1,640 (8.59)	1,621 (8.56)	1,687 (9.32)	.3918
Masters	246 (5.36)	305 (6.62)	277 (6.48)	
Black				
Bachelors	677 (3.55)	646 (3.41)	567 (3.13)	.3886
Masters	224 (4.88)	182 (3.95)	166 (3.89)	
Chicano				
Bachelors	632 (3.31)	627 (3.31)	628 (3.47)	.2616
Masters	136 (2.96)	144 (3.12)	121 (2.83)	
Filipino				
Bachelors	97 (.51)	110 (.58)	103 (.57)	.3091
Masters	12 (.26)	11 (.24)	10 (.23)	
White				
Bachelors	15,952 (83.60)	15,839 (83.65)	15,033 (83.01)	.4372
Masters	3,948 (86.01)	3,941 (85.49)	3,673 (85.98)	
Total Bachelors	19,081	18,934	18,109	.4201
Total Masters	4,590	4,610	4,272	
Total				
Bachelors	54,578 (100)	53,075 (100)	52,452 (100)	.3391
Masters	11,455 (100)	10,949 (100)	11,030 (100)	

TABLE I-13

CLASS LEVEL DISTRIBUTION OF CSUC STUDENTS - FALL 1977

	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Total
American Indian	1.3%	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Black	9.9	8.0	6.5	6.2	5.3	6.8
Filipino	1.4	1.1	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.8
Mexican American	7.6	6.9	7.2	6.2	4.9	6.4
Other Hispanic	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.3
Asian/ Pacific	6.7	6.0	5.4	6.2	5.6	5.9
White, Other	70.9	74.7	76.7	73.4	80.6	76.6
No Response (not included in other totals)	31.9	28.8	29.5	24.8	34.2	29.7

Source: "Enrollment by Ethnic Group: Fall 1977," California State University and Colleges (March 1978), as reprinted in Student Affirmative Action Task Force Report: Phase II - Retention/Support Services, September 1978, The California State University and Colleges, Long Beach, California, p. 6.

9.9 percent of the freshman class but only 6.2 percent of the senior class. Only white students had a larger percentage enrollment in the senior class than they had in the freshman class.

The primary conclusion from these data are that, among those students admitted to baccalaureate programs, Chicanos, Blacks, and American Indians are more likely to have difficulty in persisting through the educational program than do whites.

WOMEN

Enrollment

Generally, women do not have a problem in gaining admission to undergraduate-level postsecondary education in California. In Fall 1977, more than half of the Community College student body was female. During the same period, approximately 47 percent of the undergraduate student body at both the State University and the University was female. The independent colleges have the lowest enrollment of women at the undergraduate level--45 percent. During the past six years, (since Fall 1972), there has been a constant increase in the number and the percentage of women enrolled in undergraduate programs at the three public segments. (See Table I-14.) This trend in the sex composition of the undergraduate student body is consistent with available data concerning the sex composition of the eligibility pool for University and State University admissions. According to a University report, Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College?, 53 percent of the University eligibles in the high school graduating class of 1975 were women, while 58 percent of the State University eligibles were women.

The proportion of women enrolled in graduate programs at the University and at the independent institutions is substantially lower than the proportion enrolled in undergraduate programs. In Fall 1977, approximately 33 percent of the graduate students in the two segments were women. By contrast, more than 50 percent of the graduate students at the State University were women. Since Fall 1972, there has been a constant increase in the number and the percentage of women enrolled in graduate programs in public institutions. Nevertheless, women still are not enrolling at the same rate as men in graduate programs at either the University or the independent institutions.

There is considerable variation in female enrollments at the campuses of both the University and State University. (See Table I-15.) Among the University campuses, the Santa Cruz and Santa Barbara student bodies are approximately 50 percent women. Among the State University campuses, Sonoma and San Francisco have the highest

TABLE I-14

SEX COMPOSITION OF ENROLLMENTS IN CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION 1973 - 1976

	Fall 1972	Fall 1973	Fall 1974	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978
Male Students as a Percentage of Total Enrollments							
CCC	55.6%	55.0%	53.5%	54.2%	49.8%	47.4%	46.6%
CSUC Undergraduates	58.7	57.3	55.8	55.3	53.7	52.3	51.1
Graduates	54.3	52.7	51.5	50.6	48.3	47.0	45.2
Total	57.7	56.2	54.8	54.3	52.5	51.1	49.8
UC Undergraduates	55.3	54.8	54.4	54.2	53.4	52.7	52.1
Graduates	73.4	72.1	70.3	68.8	67.6	66.8	65.4
Total	60.6	59.7	58.9	58.3	57.5	56.8	56.0
Independent Institutions							
Undergraduates					53.8	55.1	
Graduates					69.0	67.5	
Total		63.2	62.9	62.5	59.7	60.3	58.8
Female Students as a Percentage of Total Enrollments							
CCC	44.4	45.0	46.5	45.8	50.2	52.6	53.4
CSUC Undergraduates	41.3	42.7	44.2	44.7	46.3	47.7	48.9
Graduates	45.7	47.3	48.5	49.4	51.7	53.0	54.8
Total	42.3	43.8	45.2	45.7	47.5	48.9	50.2
UC Undergraduates	44.7	45.2	45.6	45.8	46.6	47.3	47.9
Graduates	26.6	27.9	29.7	31.2	32.4	33.2	34.6
Total	39.4	40.3	41.1	41.7	42.5	43.2	44.0
Independent Institutions							
Undergraduates					46.2	44.9	
Graduates					31.0	32.5	
Total		36.8	37.1	34.7	40.3	39.7	41.2

levels of female enrollment--approximately 54 percent. These variations in enrollment among campuses are at least partially the result of differing programmatic emphases.

There is also considerable variation in the distribution of women among academic disciplines. (See Table I-16 and I-17.) Home economics, library science, and foreign languages tend to be dominated by women. In contrast, engineering, physical sciences, and computer and information sciences have extremely low enrollments of women. While more than 90 percent of all students majoring in home economics are women, less than 10 percent of those majoring in engineering are women. More generally, mathematics-related disciplines tend to have low enrollments of women. This situation exists at both the University and the State University.

Persistence

Available data do not provide a basis for definite conclusions about the extent to which women, as compared to men, persist in college and/or complete programs in a timely fashion. However, two indicators of persistence--sex composition of degree recipients and average age of students by sex--offer evidence that women persist at approximately the same rate as men.

In each of the four segments, the proportion of women among degree recipients is approximately equal to that of women enrolled. For example, in Fall 1977, approximately 47 percent of the undergraduate students enrolled in the University and the State University were women, and approximately 45 percent of the baccalaureate recipients were women.

During the past five years, there has been a steady increase in the percentage of women among recipients of bachelor's degrees in all segments. (See Table I-18.) Even so, among graduate and professional degree recipients at both the University and the independent institutions, women still constitute a relatively small minority.

TABLE I-15

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AND CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES PERCENT OF FEMALE ENROLLMENT BY CAMPUS, FALL 1977

University of California		State University and Colleges	
Campus	Female Enrollment	Campus	Female Enrollment
Santa Cruz	50.5%	Sonoma	54.6%
Santa Barbara	49.0	San Francisco	54.4
Davis	44.3	Bakersfield	52.0
Los Angeles	44.1	Northridge	51.7
SYSTEMWIDE	43.2	Los Angeles	51.7
Riverside	43.1	Dominguez Hills	50.6
Irvine	41.7	Hayward	50.5
San Francisco Medical Center	40.5	Stanislaus	49.8
San Diego	39.3	Long Beach	49.8
Berkeley	39.3	San Diego	49.6
		San Bernardino	49.5
		San Jose	49.4
		Chico	49.1
		SYSTEMWIDE	48.9
		Sacramento	48.4
		Fresno	48.4
		Fullerton	48.2
		Humboldt	42.0
		San Luis Obispo	38.4
		Pomona	36.7

TABLE I-16

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PERCENT ENROLLMENT BY FEMALES IN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1976		1977	
Dicipline	Female	Discipline	Female
Home Economics	91.2%	Home Economics	94.9%
Library Science	72.7	Library Science	72.6
Foreign Languages	69.4	Foreign Languages	69.5
Public Affairs and Services	69.3	Public Affairs and and Services	69.0
Fine and Applied Arts	62.0	Fine and Applied Arts	62.3
Education	61.8	Education	61.4
Area Studies	60.6	Psychology	58.8
Psychology	58.4	Communications	57.8
Letters	55.9	Area Studies	57.6
Communications	50.5	Letters	56.2
Interdisciplinary Studies	49.9	Interdisciplinary Studies	50.6
TOTAL ENROLLMENT, ALL DISCIPLINES	44.4	TOTAL ENROLLMENT, ALL DISCIPLINES	45.2
Social Sciences	42.4	Social Sciences	43.9
Agriculture and Natural Resources	39.8	Health Professions	41.5
Health Professions	39.0	Architecture and Enviromental Design	39.4
Biological Sciences	36.3	Agriculture and Natural Resources	39.0
Law	36.0	Biological Sciences	38.9
Architecture and Enviromental Design	35.3	Law	36.9
Mathematics	30.3	Business and Management	32.4
Computer and Information Sciences	20.2	Mathematics	29.5
Physical Sciences	17.6	Computer and Information Sciences	19.2
Engineering	10.4	Physical Sciences	18.3
		Engineering	11.3

TABLE I-17

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
PERCENT ENROLLMENT BY FEMALES IN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES

1976		1977	
Discipline	Female	Discipline	Female
Home Economics	97.5%	Home Economics	97.4%
Health Professions	82.7	Health Professions	83.2
Library Science	79.7	Library Science	79.8
Interdisciplinary Studies	76.1	Interdisciplinary Studies	77.1
Foreign Languages	69.9	Foreign Languages	70.5
Area Studies	60.8	Area Studies	66.9
Letters	59.8	Letters	61.4
Fine and Applied Arts	55.7	Psychology	58.2
Psychology	55.6	Education	56.7
Education	55.5	Fine and Applied Arts	56.5
TOTAL ENROLLMENT, ALL DISCIPLINES	48.3	TOTAL ENROLLMENT, ALL DISCIPLINES	50.1
Public Affairs and Services	42.7	Public Affairs and Services	46.5
Social Sciences	41.5	Social Sciences	43.6
Biological Sciences	38.6	Communications	41.2
Communications	37.4	Biological Sciences	41.2
Mathematics	34.5	Mathematics	33.3
Business and Management	26.5	Business and Management	30.7
Agriculture and Natural Resources	29.7	Agriculture and Natural Resources	29.7
Computer and Information Sciences	21.9	Architecture and Environmental Design	23.6
Architecture and Environmental Design	19.7	Computer and Information Sciences	22.2
Physical Sciences	19.2	Physical Sciences	20.6
Engineering	4.6	Engineering	5.2

TABLE I-18

SEX COMPOSITION OF DEGREE RECIPIENTS IN CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION 1972-73 THROUGH 1977-78

	1972-1973	1973-1974	1974-1975	1975-1976	1976-1977
Men as a Percent of Total Degree Recipients					
CCC					
Associate Degree		57.6%	55.4%	56.2%	53.4%
CSUC					
Bachelor's Degree	60.6%	59.4	57.6	56.2	54.9
Master's Degree	60.6	56.3	56.6	53.1	50.0
UC					
Bachelor's Degree	55.9	55.0	53.9	54.1	54.1
Master's Degree	66.3	66.6	63.7	64.4	61.5
Doctorate Degree	81.5	81.7	80.2	78.5	79.1
First Professional Degree	86.2	84.6	78.0	73.2	71.7
Independent Institutions					
Bachelor's Degree	60.1	59.5	59.8	59.8	58.8
Master's Degree	74.0	72.9	68.5	66.6	65.9
Doctorate Degree	84.4	81.0	83.3	79.2	76.8
First Professional Degree	92.2	88.7	85.1	83.9	80.8
Women as a Percent of Total Degree Recipients					
CCC					
Associate Degree		42.4	44.6	43.8	46.6
CSUC					
Bachelor's Degree	39.4	40.6	42.4	43.8	45.1
Master's Degree	39.4	43.8	43.4	46.9	50.0
UC					
Bachelor's Degree	44.1	45.0	46.1	45.9	45.9
Master's Degree	33.7	33.4	36.3	35.6	38.5
Doctorate Degree	18.5	18.3	19.8	21.5	20.9
First Professional Degree	13.8	15.4	22.0	26.8	28.4
Independent Institutions					
Bachelor's Degree	39.9	40.5	40.2	40.2	41.2
Master's Degree	26.0	27.1	31.5	33.4	34.1
Doctorate Degree	15.6	19.0	16.7	20.8	23.2
First Professional Degree	7.8	11.3	14.9	16.1	19.2

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn concerning educational opportunities for ethnic minorities and women:

1. In comparison with their representation both in the State's population and in the elementary/secondary schools, Chicanos and Blacks are underrepresented in postsecondary institutions. The underrepresentation of Chicano students is particularly severe since they constitute the largest and fastest-growing ethnic minority group in California.

2. During the past four years, some progress has been made in increasing the enrollment of ethnic minority undergraduate students in California postsecondary institutions. At the graduate level, however, little progress has been made in increasing minority enrollments. The participation and representation of Asian students have increased in each of the four segments, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Similar increases have occurred for Chicano students; however, these increases have not kept pace with the growth of the Chicano population in California. Progress in increasing the enrollment of Black students has been more limited; there has been no increase in their overall participation and representation during the period from Fall 1975 through Fall 1978.

3. Compared to the enrollment pattern for all students in postsecondary education, American-Indian, Black and Chicano undergraduates have a higher concentration in the Community Colleges, but an extremely low representation in the University. At the graduate level, American-Indian, Black and Chicano students have a higher concentration in the State University, but a low representation in the University.

4. Among students admitted to baccalaureate programs, Chicanos, Blacks and American Indians are more likely to have difficulty in persisting through their educational program than are white and Asian students.

5. There is great variation in the ethnic distribution of students among academic programs. Chicano, Black and American-Indian students have proportionally higher enrollments in the less-empirical disciplines than in the more scientific and mathematically oriented disciplines. In contrast, Asian and white students have higher proportional enrollments in the latter disciplines than in the social sciences.

6. Women enroll at the undergraduate level at approximately the same rate as men. In addition, progress has been made during the past six years in increasing the number and the percentage of women enrolled in graduate programs. However, the proportion of women enrolled in graduate programs at the University of California and the independent colleges and universities is still substantially lower than the proportion enrolled in undergraduate programs.

FOOTNOTES

1/ *Those Who Stay - Phase II: Student Continuance in the California State University and Colleges*. Technical Memorandum Number 8, Division of Institutional Research, California State University and Colleges, May 1979, p. 1.

CHAPTER II

BARRIERS TO EXPANDED PARTICIPATION OF ETHNIC MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

A number of crucial questions arise within the context of "equal educational opportunity." Perhaps the two most commonly asked are: Why are ethnic minority, low-income, and women students still underrepresented in postsecondary education? What barriers limit their equal participation?

A review of available research indicates that factors accounting for the disparities in the enrollment, persistence, and distribution of low-income, ethnic minority and women students in postsecondary education are complex and interrelated. Poverty is perhaps the most significant social factor that inhibits the participation of low-income students, as are parents' level of education for ethnic minorities and the socialization process for many women students. Other socio-cultural and socio-economic factors that contribute to the lower participation rates of these student groups are poor housing and health conditions; high unemployment rates; higher concentration in low-skilled, unskilled, and service occupations; absence of learning reinforcements in the home; limited English skills; and, sometimes, cultural conflicts.

There is little that educational institutions can do to remove socio-economic and socio-cultural barriers. However, there are a number of institutional policies and practices that pose potential barriers to equal participation for ethnic minority, low-income and women students to which institutions can respond.

The following discussion centers around four social institutions and (1) the barriers they present, and/or (2) the role they play in equalizing opportunity for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students. The institutions described are the public schools (K-12), postsecondary institutions, the private sector, and public policy boards.

The barriers cited in this discussion are not limited to the groups of students identified above. However, these barriers pose greater problems for these students than for the majority who pursue a college education. It should also be noted that while each group is given simultaneous attention in this chapter, each has its own unique cultural, political, and historical experience in the United States.

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Despite the expectations for an end to segration following Brown v. Topeka, there are more students attending segregated schools in California today than there were twelve years ago. Ratios of students to counseling staff in urban schools range from 250:1 to 400:1. The high school drop-out rate in major cities remains approximately 40 percent. And of those minority students who graduate from high school, a disproportionately small number are eligible to attend the four-year colleges and universities. Urban students, particularly minorities and women, are especially affected by the inequities in the California public school system.

Desegregation

Historically, Asian immigrants, American Indians, Chicanos, and Blacks have been segregated--either on reservations, urban ghettos, or barrios. Educationally, the result has been evident in unequal facilities, instruction, curriculum, learning resources, and even in teacher attitudes toward the educability of ethnic minority students.

As stated earlier, it was hoped that desegregation of public schools would improve this situation. Today, however, there are more schools in California with a 50 percent or better minority enrollment, and larger proportions of minority students attending such schools than there were prior to desegregation attempts. To illustrate, in 1977 there were 768 more schools with 50 percent or better minority enrollment and 503,493 more students attending these schools than there were in 1967. The effect of this is that while 27.9 percent of all students are enrolled in predominantly minority schools, 72.7 percent of all Blacks, 57.1 percent of all Chicanos, 54.1 percent of all Filipinos, 42 percent of all Asians, and 21.6 percent of all American Indians are enrolled in such schools. 1/

Students in urban schools face a 40 percent chance of dropping out before graduating, as compared to the national average of 20 percent. 2/ National statistics reveal that over the last decade, assaults on students have increased 85 percent, robberies on school campuses are up by 35 percent, rapes have increased 40 percent, homicides are up 18 percent, and weapons confiscated from students on school grounds half again what they were in 1970. 3/ Both the reading and writing skills of high school students have declined markedly. And as mentioned earlier, counselor-to-student ratios in urban schools range from 1:250 to 1:400.

Several factors account for this increase in the number of schools with predominantly minority enrollments. Among them are: a 39 percent increase in total minority enrollment, coupled with a 17 percent decrease in white enrollment; the "white flight" from urban public schools to suburban and/or private schools; and the ambiguous definitions of "segregation" and "racial isolation" provided by the State Board of Education (Appendix C). In effect, these definitions are left to the local school boards. By July 1, 1979, each school district was to have certified that it had no segregated schools, or schools in danger of becoming segregated, or present plans to remedy the situation within any schools that were still segregated.

Counseling and Teaching Staffs: A Lack of Role Models

A recent study documented the fact that few students receive any formal guidance in planning for their futures, any assistance getting through school, or any help in understanding themselves and others. Some students, however, suffer more from this lack of counseling than do others:

> Urban students, particularly women and minorities, pay a greater price for this lack of direction and information. Large urban schools have fewer resources available for guidance services than their suburban counterparts, yet their students' needs for those resources are far greater. For these young people, the schools are frequently the sole source of the information and guidance they desperately need. 4/

In addition to the lack of counseling and guidance, there is an absence of role models with which ethnic minority students can identify. Table II-1 clearly illustrates that minority students attending public schools (K-12) have fewer role models than do white students. Chicanos are least likely to be exposed to role models. While Chicanos make up nearly 21 percent of the K-12 enrollment, less than 5 percent of the teachers and credentialled staff are Chicano.

TABLE II-1

K-12
ENROLLMENTS AND CREDENTIALLED STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	% K-12 Enrollment	% Teachers and Other Credentialled Staff
White	63.5%	85.4%
Chicano	20.8	4.9
Black	10.0	5.9
Asian	3.5	2.7
Filipino	1.2	.4
American Indian	.9	.6
	99.9%	99.9%

Source: California State Department of Education, Office of Intergroup Relations, Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students and Staff in California Public Schools, Fall 1977.

Young minority and women students are not very likely to see members of their own groups in leadership or professional positions; e.g., legislators, doctors, engineers, dentists, businessmen and businesswomen, college presidents and administrators, or high school teachers and principals. In addition, ethnic minority and women students do not have the same "unofficial network of helpers" available to them, as is available to white male students. In the absence of favorable role models, these students are less likely to aspire to, prepare for, or to achieve positions of leadership. In addition, students who do not have an opportunity to interact with minority and women professionals are not likely to develop favorable attitudes that would help them move beyond traditionally negative cultural and social stereotypes.

All young and impressionable students need to observe and interact with professionals of their own group. They need to be assured and reassured that formal education and professional training are realistic and valuable goals, regardless of ethnicity, sex, or economic status. There currently are a number of programs sponsored by postsecondary institutions and industry-sponsored programs that provide junior and senior high school students that opportunity. (See Chapter III.) School district administrators should establish more and closer ties with the business and professional community to develop programs whereby more low-income, ethnic minority, and women students can observe and have on-going communication with minority and women professionals. Further, such opportunities should not be limited to a select group of students; instead they should be integrated into the regular school curriculum as a benefit to all students.

The Problem of Differential Achievement

A study conducted by the Office of Outreach Services of the University of California identified the problem of differential achievement as the major barrier for low-income and ethnic minority students in achieving a postsecondary education. The study found that students within the same achievement groups enrolled in postsecondary institutions at similar rates, regardless of ethnic or economic status. 5/ The problem, however, is that low-income and ethnic minority students are not evenly distributed among the different achievement groups. In the highest achievement group (those students eligible to attend the University of California) minority and low-income high school graduates appeared with only one-third the frequency of white high school graduates. In the second highest achievement group (those eligible to attend the California State University and Colleges), ethnic minorities and low-income high school graduates appeared with only one-half the frequency of white high school graduates. Ethnic minorities and low-income students were more likely to fall in the lowest achievement group (those ineligible to attend either the University or the State University), than were white high school graduates. (It can be anticipated that the new proficiency requirements for graduation from high school will have a particularly negative impact on ethnic minority students in this lowest achievement group.)

These differences are reflected in the ethnic enrollments of the State's postsecondary institutions: As Chapter I illustrated, 73 percent of the Caucasian students enrolled in public degree-granting institutions are enrolled in California Community Colleges, as compared to 80.7 percent of the Black students, 78.5 percent of the Chicano students, and 80.6 percent of the American Indian students. Similarly, while 6.8 percent of all students enrolled in public degree-granting institutions attend the University, only 3.1 percent of the Black students, 4 percent of the Chicano students, and 2.8 percent of the American Indians do so. However, Asian American students, as a group, enroll in higher proportions at the University, and lower proportions in the Community Colleges than do all students.

As a group, women achieve eligibility for admission at higher rates than do men. To illustrate, 53 percent of the high school graduates eligible for admission to the University and 58 percent of those eligible for admission to the State University are women. 6/ Even so, women enroll in undergraduate programs at approximately the same rate as men, but enroll in graduate programs at a substantially lower rate.

Chicano and Black students are less likely to enroll in college preparatory courses in high school than are white and Asian students. In the West Coast School District (Berkeley) for example, Blacks and Chicanos are more likely to enroll in the non-college or terminal track mathematics courses and less likely to enroll in the calculus track. Conversely, whites and Asians are more likely to enroll in the calculus track. Little difference was found between males and females in this regard. (See Table II-2.)

TABLE II-2

TRACKING IN HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS BY SEX AND ETHNICITY

	Non-College Track 1/		Terminal Mathematics Track 2/		Calculus Track 3/		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Ethnicity								
Asian	9	4%	36	17%	173	79%	218	100%
White	60	5	283	23	895	72	1,238	100
Hispanic	18	31	26	44	15	25	59	100
Black	342	34	474	47	200	20	1,016	100
Other	3	-	3	-	6	-	12	100
Sex								
Male	252	19%	418	32%	651	49%	1,321	100%
Female	180	15	405	33	638	52	1,233	100
Total	432	17%	822	32%	1,289	51%	2,544	100%

1/ Courses intended for students who are not expected to go to college or who do poorly on a sixth grade test of basic arithmetic skills. Includes Basic Math, Consumer Math, etc.

2/ Courses intended for students who are not expected to go on in mathematics. Includes Algebra 1, spread out over three semesters, or a self-paced Algebra laboratory and Geometry 110 and 120.

3/ Courses intended for students expected to take Freshman Calculus in college. Includes Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Elementary Functions and Calculus.

4/ Race and sex were not reported for all students in the terminal mathematics track. Hence, the sum of the sex and ethnicity columns are not all equal.

Source: Weekly attendance lists of a West Coast District, with a record of commitment to desegregation, as prepared by Lucy W. Sells.

The data in Table II-2 illustrate that while desegregation may result in equal use of school facilities, "resegregation" can and does occur in the classrooms. While the example presented concerns mathematics, it is not unreasonable to suspect that similar situations would be found in other college preparatory courses.

These data also indicate the importance of counseling and encouraging, perhaps even recruiting, Blacks and Chicanos to enroll in college preparatory courses. And finally, this information stresses the need to identify and deal with the filters that close many doors for disadvantaged students. For example, there is a lack of awareness on the part of many low-income students and their parents of (1) the value of quantitative skills in an increasingly technological society; and (2) of the long-term importance of taking and successfully passing the sixth grade arithmetic skills test.

All of these problems must be responded to while the public schools are experiencing increasing fiscal constraints. Educational programs have been cut in many schools in response to Proposition 13, and these developments will have a negative impact on the academic preparation of high school graduates during the coming decade.

POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

California has attempted to equalize educational opportunity at the elementary and secondary levels. At the postsecondary level, however, students from higher-income families and with higher academic-achievement levels are still more likely to participate. In spite of the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, which committed the nation to the goal of equal educational opportunity in postsecondary education for all citizens, significant enrollments of low-income and ethnic minority students still a rare achievement for four-year colleges and universities. Some of the factors that contribute to this situation are college admission requirements, lack of support services, faculty and staff attitudes, and the college curriculum.

Admissions Criteria

California public postsecondary institutions established, and have adhered closely to, admissions criteria consistent with the 1960 Master Plan guidelines. Aside from the small percentage of students admitted by special action (many of whom are admitted through the Educational Opportunity Program), 7/ few attempts have been made to experiment with alternative admissions criteria for low-income ethnic minority students. Thus, efforts to increase low-income and ethnic minority enrollments at the four-year public institutions have focused on expanded outreach programs. The University of California has extended its outreach activity to include junior high school students, while the California State University and Colleges has extended its activity to the community and to high school students in grades nine through eleven. These efforts are expected to increase the pool of low-income and ethnic minority students eligible for admission under the regular criteria. This report is intended to encourage administrators, faculty, staff, and students alike to examine the need for changes which would improve the institution's responsiveness to the special needs of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students.

Since the traditional college-going age population is expected to change dramatically over the next ten to fifteen years, it seems appropriate for the postsecondary institutions to continue to explore these questions: "Are SAT scores and grade point averages the best and/or only way to define the 'top one-third' for the California State University and Colleges and 'top one-eighth' for the University of California? Are there other characteristics that ought to be considered in measuring achievement level?"

Similarly, graduate and professional schools should question the assumption that numerical indices such as grades and standardized tests are the best measures of quality, merit, individual worth, or potential. The U.S. Supreme Court, in the Bakke case, borrowed from an earlier decision to make the point that the attainment of a diverse student body is a constitutionally permissible goal for an institution of higher education:

> The Nation's future depends upon leaders trained through wide exposure to that robust exchange of ideas which discovers truth "out of a multitude of tongues, rather than through any kind of authoritative selection."
>
> [from Keyishian v. Board of Regents,
> 385 US 589, 603 (1967)] 8/

The Court further held that race could be taken into account in admissions decisions. Ethnic diversity, however, is only one element in a range of factors a university can properly consider in attaining the goal of a diverse student body. The Bakke decision has allowed graduate and professional schools to restructure their admissions policies and procedures to ensure a heterogeneous student body.

Many outreach staff and other graduate and professional school administrators perceive a "chilling effect" of Bakke on the number of minority applicants. Others argue that minority students are not going on to graduate and professional school because of the job opportunities open to them with a baccalaureate degree.

It is more than likely that a combination of these and other factors are contributing to the decline in applications by minority students for admission to graduate and professional schools. Perhaps graduate institutions should consider evening or reduced course-load programs designed to attract ethnic minorities who have entered the work force and are unable to attend on a full-time basis.

Student Services

While many college and university campuses have developed learning assistance centers, peer counseling programs, and other types of support services, many low-income, ethnic minority, and women students who enroll in postsecondary institutions do not persist at the same rate as do other students. Many low-income students are forced to work because of the family's economic status and because of cultural pressures to help the family "at any cost." For many such students college is a new and threatening environment. One very significant variable that contributes to the perceived (or actual) alienation is the mode of communication on campus. Many students are unaccustomed to the administrative procedures--e.g., application forms, add/drop forms, petition forms, computer registration, and other rules and regulations--used by the institution. And finally, students are often too busy just surviving in a new environment to seek out support services of which they generally are unaware.

The support services which postsecondary institutions provide, or fail to provide, for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students significantly influence student enrollment and persistence. Counseling, career guidance, basic skills, survival skills, and child-care services are of particular importance to these students.

A number of reports have shown that the tendency of minority and women students to limit their career and college aspirations is at least partially a result of the counseling they receive in high school and college. 10/ In one of the studies (Westervelt, 1975) counselor behavior in interviews was observed. Female counselees presented themselves as recent undergraduate transfers with high mathematical ability, trying to decide between a mathematics or elementary education major. The results showed that 80 percent of both male and female counselors advised the young women to enter elementary education.

It should also be noted that in each of the studies minority and women students reported one of three types of contact with high school and college counselors: (1) they had never seen a counselor; (2) they saw a counselor for only the most routine or required matters; or (3) they went to a teacher or faculty member instead.

Career guidance is equally important for minority and women students. Postsecondary institutions should begin career guidance early in a student's academic career so that he or she have a practical understanding of the labor market.

Basic skills courses are essential in aiding students from academically disadvantaged backgrounds to upgrade their skills. Of equal importance is providing these students with basic survival skills, e.g., what are the official rules, regulations, policies, and procedures with which they should be familiar? Any student can become discouraged by an array of institutional rules that are not appropriate to his or her particular situation. However, the student who knows how to deal with the situation is less likely to become discouraged.

The availability of child-care services can be the factor that determines whether women enter, re-enter, or continue their education. 11/ Thus, child care services are of critical importance to women students. (See Chapter VIII.)

Faculty and Staff: A Need for Role Models and Staff Development

The need for positive role models is also critical at the college and university level--both in and out of the classroom. Both positive role models and mentor relationships have a lasting impact on the student's self-image, aspirations, and motivation to succeed. Inside the classroom, however, many minority and women students have found that few faculty members have an understanding of their unique problems, experiences, and cultural differences. Many minority students, in particular, feel uneasy approaching a faculty member for help--and often do not do so. Obviously, this creates a communication barrier between the student and faculty.

Outside the classroom, minority student groups have had to push for programs that meet their needs, and have frequently met with resistance (and sometimes hostility) on the part of the administrative staff. These unnecessary conflicts create negative attitudes toward the institution and its personnel.

Faculty and staff affirmative action efforts have, to some extent, alleviated the situation. Students have turned to the ethnic minority and women faculty and staff for support and encouragement. Academic and administrative staff have also turned to the ethnic minority and women faculty and staff for assistance in dealing with the unique problems of these students. However, since minority and women faculty represent a disproportionately small percentage of the full-time tenured faculty in public postsecondary education (Table II-3) and administrative staff (Table II-4), and since they receive

TABLE II-3

FULL-TIME FACULTY BY TENURE STATUS - ALL SEGMENTS

Tenure Status	Total	Sex		Ethnicity				
	# %	Male	Female	White (Non-Hispanic)	Black (Non-Hispanic)	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander	American Indian or Alaskan Native
Community Colleges								
Tenured	14,094	9,836	4,258	12,489	590	625	331	59
	100%	69.8%	30.2%	88.6%	4.2%	4.4%	2.3%	.4%
Non-Tenured on Track 1/	1,705	865	840	1,348	129	135	82	11
	100%	50.7%	49.3%	79.1%	7.6%	7.9%	4.8%	.6%
Other 2/	1,122	688	434	951	44	93	31	3
	100%	61.3%	38.7%	84.8%	3.9%	8.3%	2.8%	.3%
California State University and Colleges								
Tenured	8,949	7,408	1,541	8,124	182	175	441	27
	100%	82.8%	17.2%	90.8%	2.0%	2.0%	4.9%	.3%
Non-Tenured on Track	1,643	1,154	489	1,343	98	97	90	15
	100%	70.2%	29.8%	81.7%	6.0%	5.9%	5.5%	.9%
Other	1,370	915	455	1,130	48	108	70	14
	100%	66.8%	33.2%	82.5%	3.5%	7.9%	5.1%	1.0%
University of California								
Tenured	5,144	4,801	343	4,744	67	94	226	13
	100%	93.3%	6.7%	92.2%	1.3%	1.8%	4.4%	.3%
Non-Tenured on Track	1,521	1,181	340	1,297	58	78	77	11
	100%	77.6%	22.4%	85.3%	3.8%	5.1%	5.1%	.7%
Other	6,674	4,980	1,694	5,753	150	156	581	34
	100%	74.6%	25.4%	86.2%	2.2%	2.3%	8.7%	.5%
All Public Segments								
Tenured	28,187	22,045	6,142	25,357	839	894	998	99
	100%	78.2%	21.8%	90.0%	3.0%	3.2%	3.5%	.4%
Non-Tenured on Track	4,869	3,200	1,669	3,988	285	310	249	37
	100%	65.7%	34.3%	81.9%	5.9%	6.4%	5.1%	.8%
Other	9,166	6,583	2,583	7,834	242	357	682	51
	100%	71.8%	28.2%	85.5%	2.6%	3.9%	7.4%	.6%
TOTAL #	42,222	31,828	10,394	37,179	1,366	1,561	1,929	187
%	100%	75.4%	24.6%	88.1%	3.2%	3.7%	4.6%	.4%

1/ Faculty who are not yet tenured but are in a tenure track position.
2/ Includes such persons as visiting faculty, faculty on short-term contract, etc.

TABLE II-4

SEX AND ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF FULL-TIME FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF - BY SEGMENT

	Total	Sex		Ethnicity				
		Male	Female	White (Non-Hispanic)	Black (Non-Hispanic)	Hispanic	Asian or Pacific Islander	American Indian or Alaskan Native
Community Colleges								
Executive/Administrative Managerial	2,384 100%	1,914 80.3%	470 19.7%	2,004 84.1%	165 6.9%	128 5.4%	66 2.8%	21 .9%
Faculty	16,921 100%	11,389 67.3%	5,532 32.7%	14,788 87.4%	763 4.5%	853 5.0%	444 2.6%	73 .4%
*Professional Non-Faculty	1,168 100%	658 56.3%	510 43.7%	890 76.2%	95 8.1%	103 8.8%	79 6.8%	1 .1%
California State University and Colleges								
Executive/Administrative Managerial	341 100%	321 94.1%	20 5.9%	320 93.8%	10 2.9%	9 2.6%	2 .6%	0 -
Faculty	11,962 100%	9,477 79.2%	2,485 20.8%	10,597 88.6%	328 2.7%	380 3.2%	601 5.0%	56 .5%
Professional Non-Faculty	3,333 100%	1,923 57.7%	1,410 42.3%	2,661 79.8%	220 6.6%	217 6.5%	197 5.9%	38 1.1%
University of California								
Executive/Administrative Managerial	1,724 100%	1,168 67.7%	556 32.3%	1,521 88.2%	109 6.3%	49 2.8%	40 2.3%	5 .3%
Faculty	13,339 100%	10,962 82.2%	2,377 17.8%	11,794 88.4%	275 2.1%	328 2.5%	884 6.6%	58 .4%
Professional Non-Faculty	11,861 100%	4,200 35.4%	7,661 64.6%	9,557 80.6%	528 4.5%	397 3.3%	1,331 11.2%	48 .4%
All Segments								
Executive/Administrative Managerial	4,449 100%	3,403 76.5%	1,046 23.5%	3,845 86.4%	284 6.4%	186 4.2%	108 2.4%	26 .6%
Faculty	42,222 100%	31,828 75.4%	10,394 24.6%	37,179 88.1%	1,366 3.2%	1,561 3.7%	1,929 4.6%	187 .4%
Professional Non-Faculty	16,362 100%	6,781 41.4%	9,581 58.6%	13,108 80.1%	843 5.2%	717 4.4%	1,607 9.8%	87 .5%
TOTAL	63,033 100%	42,012 66.7%	21,021 33.3%	54,132 85.9%	2,493 4.0%	2,464 3.9%	3,644 5.8%	300 .5%

* Classification includes counselors and other professional staff members not included in the faculty or executive, administrative and managerial categories.

no release time for this function, they are overburdened by the added responsibility.

In spite of affirmative action efforts, positive role models remain in short supply for minority and women students. While 27 percent of the undergraduate students attending postsecondary institutions in California are ethnic minorities, only 11.9 percent of the full-time faculty and 13.6 percent of the executive/administrative staff are ethnic minorities. Similarly, while women make up approximately 50 percent of the undergraduate population, only 24.6 percent of the full-time faculty and 23.5 percent of the executive/administrative staff are women. Minorities and women are most likely to be employed as counselors or other student services staff--minorities total 19.9 percent and women 58.6 percent of the full-time, professional non-academic staff.

The need for role models is perhaps most critical in the classroom. However, as noted in Table II-3, minority and women faculty are not likely to have tenure. To illustrate, while 27 percent of the undergraduates in California institutions are minorities, only 11.3 percent of the Community College tenured faculty, 9.2 percent of the State University tenured faculty, and 7.8 percent of the University tenured faculty are ethnic minorities. And while women make up nearly 50 percent of the undergraduate enrollment, only 30.2 percent of the Community College tenured faculty, 17.2 percent of the State University tenured faculty, and 6.7 percent of the University tenured faculty are women. Minorities and women faculty do make up 18.2 percent and 34.3 percent, respectively, of the faculty in tenure "track" positions. Perhaps one measure of commitment to affirmative action is the extent to which these faculty members receive tenure over the next few years.

Clearly there is a need for more minority and women faculty and staff in the colleges. However, the solution to problems of retention and academic progress of ethnic minority and women students require fundamental changes in the manner in which all faculty, staff, and administrators relate to them. Such changes require staff development programs aimed at making the academic personnel keenly aware of the unique needs, experiences, and cultural influences on these groups of students.

Curriculum

It is clear from the earlier discussion that low-income, ethnic minority students, while highly motivated, are often not prepared for college and university instruction. The college and university curricula often do not reflect the needs of ethnic minority students in general and those of limited-English-speaking students in particular.

Refining curriculum offerings to meet the needs of the changing clientele is not a novel concept, but it is one which has met much resistance. As early as 1964, one educator urged the following at a conference sponsored by the Institute of Higher Education:

> We have to take our young people as they are. It is clear that large numbers of them are not "qualified" owing largely to deprivation of the past, to enter existing programs of education, that they are not in good positions to "benefit" from these programs. It is our task, then, to create programs and institutions that they can benefit from. 12/

Few institutions have made these kinds of changes in their curricula largely due to the threat it posed to institutional academic standards. However, years later the California State University and Colleges recognized the problem in its Student Affirmative Action Plan:

> So long as large numbers of students continue to come from high school with unsatisfactory command of fundamental academic skills, there will be need for opportunities to overcome deficiencies in these skills in college. Without them, college admission is a cruel hoax 13/

The Student Affirmative Action Plan adopted by the California Community Colleges states that basic skills instruction and remediation should be the major thrust of student affirmative action efforts. Many of the Community Colleges have, in fact, developed intensive remedial and basic skills programs.

It is incumbent upon the four-year institutions to take a critical look at their educational programs and answer the questions: "What are the needs of these students? Does the academic program respond to their needs? If not, how should it be changed or expanded?"

And finally, it is essential that the postsecondary segments develop strong patterns of cooperation to address adequately and carry out jointly the responsibility for preparing students for survival in and successful completion of a postsecondary education.

THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Private industry has a significant role to play in equalizing opportunities for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students. Many of the major corporations have developed community projects, summer internships, and minority recruitment programs. Most of these projects are aimed at motivating young people to consider postsecondary education and/or formal training for a career in particular industries. Postsecondary institutions actively participate in these programs mentioned above. They argue, however, that there are not enough such opportunities available for interested students.

Ethnic minority and women practitioners from the private and public sectors can be extremely effective in conveying to high school students the importance of a postsecondary education. Many campuses utilize these representatives at annual "career days." The commitment, however, must go beyond one or two visits per year. Young students need continual reinforcement from as many role models as possible. Programs are needed wherein minority and women practitioners are given a paid leave of absence to work with minority and women youth. Formal relationships must be established between the high school districts, college and university campuses, and private industry to assure a maximum use of resources in outreach efforts.

In addition, industry can aid in the retention of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students by establishing paid student internship programs. While employed as interns, students have an opportunity to learn and work in an agency or company that offers a career in which they may be interested. More importantly, students are given an incentive to complete their education. In exchange for providing this opportunity, the agency or company receives low-cost help while the student is in training, has an opportunity to screen potential candidates for full-time positions, and benefits from a more diverse work force. Therefore, both the student and the company gain from internship programs.

PUBLIC POLICY BOARDS

Statewide educational policy boards can play a significant role in breaking down obstacles to further progress in equal educational opportunity.

In recent years there has been some improvement in the representation of women and minorities on such boards. However, as of January 1980, women accounted for less than one-third (29.89 percent) of the membership on State level educational policy boards (including the State Board of Education, the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges, the Board of Trustees of the State University, the Regents of the University, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission). Blacks account for 12.64 percent; Chicanos, 6.90 percent; Asians, 3.45 percent of the membership of these boards.

American Indians and Filipinos are not represented. These data indicate that, compared to the sex and ethnic composition of California society, women and ethnic minorities are underrepresented on State level educational policy boards.

With few advocates in positions of authority, low-income and minority citizens, and women, are to some extent, excluded from the decision making process. Inadequate representation may result in a lack of awareness and understanding of the educational needs faced by these groups. At a time when educational budgets are being cut, a thorough understanding of these issues is essential.

While each of the institutions described in this chapter plays a different role in equalizing opportunity for underrepresented students, a comprehensive strategy is needed to expand the participation of these students in postsecondary education. Without a cooperative approach, the disabilities of poverty in-school problems, college admissions practices, lack of adequate support services, and lack of role models, will continue to work against equality of opportunity for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students in California postsecondary education.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions may be drawn from the information presented in this chapter.

1. Equality of opportunity must be part of a comprehensive strategy that involves changes in educational, institutional, and societal priorities.

2. While there is little that postsecondary institutions can do to eliminate socio-economic and socio-cultural barriers that limit the college participation of underrepresented students, there are a number of institutional barriers to which faculty and administrators should seek to remove.

3. Institutional barriers that discourage or impede the participation of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students are most evident in rigid college admission requirements, traditional college curricula, lack of adequate support services, and lack of faculty and staff role models.

4. Recent efforts to increase minority enrollments have focused on expanding the pool of eligible students. However, little has been done to systematically seek alternative methods of measuring the college-achievement potential of minority students.

5. The support services which postsecondary institutions provide, or fail to provide, have a significant influence on the enrollment and persistence of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students. While many campuses have developed support services to assist all students, few have carefully examined the effectiveness of these services in meeting the needs of underrepresented students.

6. A lack of understanding and awareness of the unique problems faced by low-income, ethnic minority, and women students can create barriers between students and faculty and staff. While affirmative action efforts are essential in eliminating these barriers, they should be complemented with staff development programs aimed at helping all faculty and staff become aware of the needs, experiences, and cultural influences affecting underrepresented students.

7. Students from underrepresented groups, while highly motivated, often are not prepared academically for the demands of the undergraduate program. Since these students are expected to make up an increasing proportion of the college-going age group, the undergraduate curriculum should make provision for courses which would meet the special academic needs of these students.

FOOTNOTES

1/ *Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students and Staff in California Public Schools, Fall 1977*, California State Department of Education, 1978.

2/ *Lost in the Shuffle*, Open Road Issues Research, 1979.

3/ *Violent Schools - Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress*, Department of HEW, January 1978.

4/ *Op. cit.*, p. 8.

5/ *Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College?*, University of California, Office of Outreach Services, May 1978.

6/ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

7/ The California State University and Colleges admits 2 percent of its freshmen and 2 percent of its transfer applicants through special action. The University of California (beginning in Fall 1979) will admit 6 percent of its freshmen and 4 percent of its transfer applicants by special action.

8/ Excerpt from the *Bakke* decision reprinted in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 10, 1978.

9/ "A Comprehensive Approach to the Problems of Bilingual-Bicultural Students." *Beyond Desegregation*, The College Board, 1978.

10/ See: Moore, Kathryn M. "The Cooling Out of Two-Year College Women." Paper presented at the 59th annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, April 1974. ED 091 021; Moore, Kathryn and Veres, Helen C. *A Study of Two-Year College Women in Central New York State: Characteristics, Career Determinants, and Perceptions*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education, 1975. ED 103 069; Open Roads Issues Research. *Lost in the Shuffle*; U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. National Center for Education Statistics. *Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education* by Esther Westervelt. NCES 75-407. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975. ED 111 256; and University of California. *Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College?*

11/ Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality, Judith M. Gappa and Barbara S. Uehling, p. 27, 1979.

12/ "Implications for Education and for Adjustment of Curricula to Individual Students," Universal Higher Education, pp. 40-64, 1966.

13/ A Framework for Student Affirmative Action in the California State University and Colleges, California State University and Colleges, December 1978.

CHAPTER III

EXISTING CAMPUS-BASED PROGRAMS

Throughout California, there are a multitude of campus-based student affirmative action programs funded by federal, State, and local government, as well as by private foundations, private industry, and/or institutional funds. The following discussion will distinguish between student affirmative action programs operated by the public schools (K-12) and those operated by postsecondary institutions, as well as between pre-college and in-college programs. Among the policy questions which must be considered are: Who should have primary responsibility for administering pre-college programs--the public school sector or the postsecondary sector? What are the most effective methods for developing cooperative efforts between secondary and postsecondary institutions?

This chapter (1) provides an extensive inventory of formal student affirmative action programs, (2) identifies particularly successful model programs, (3) reviews the interrelationship among the various types of programs, and (4) discusses the problems which must be resolved in order to increase the benefits from these programs. It should be noted that student affirmative action efforts by individual faculty members may exist on some campuses, although such efforts have not reached the formal program level. In most cases, these efforts have not been identified by the systemwide offices and therefore are not included in this inventory.

FEDERALLY FUNDED PROGRAMS

The U.S. Office of Education provides extensive funding for four major programs designed to respond to the needs of students from "disadvantaged" backgrounds. Two of the programs--"Upward Bound" and "Talent Search"--were established initially as part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The purpose of these two complementary, pre-college programs was to overcome deficiencies in secondary school counseling and to provide tutorial and enrichment programs. Upward Bound offered a variety of support services for disadvantaged high school students and graduates interested in college. Talent Search provided enrichment to junior or senior high school students. The two programs were transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the U.S. Office of Education in 1969, by authority of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968.

A third program established by the Amendments was Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, which was designed to provide remedial and other special services to postsecondary-level students who are educationally or economically disadvantaged, who are physically handicapped, or who have limited English-speaking ability. Educational Opportunity Centers, the fourth program, was established in 1973, with centers to be located in low-income neighborhoods to disseminate information on academic and financial assistance for college.

Upward Bound

The Upward Bound program was designed to reach low-income high school students who have the potential to successfully complete a postsecondary education program but who, due to inadequate preparation and/or lack of motivation, cannot meet traditional admission requirements. Through the use of various intervention strategies--remedial instruction, exposure to new or altered curricula, tutoring, cultural enrichment activities, counseling, and encouragement--Upward Bound attempts to develop the skills and motivation necessary for participants to gain admission to college and successfully complete their postsecondary education. During the summer session, Upward Bound students usually live on a college or university campus for an intensive, six- to eight-week session with formal course work, cultural and social events, and counseling. During the regular school year, students attend Saturday classes, receive periodic tutoring and counseling, and participate in some cultural enrichment activities. Students also receive assistance in preparing and submitting applications for admission and financial aid.

Upward Bound programs have been established at twenty postsecondary institutions in California: nine State University campuses, four University campuses, and five independent colleges. In 1978-79, total federal funding for these programs was approximately $3.2 million. A recent evaluation of the nationwide Upward Bound program reported the following findings on its impact: 1/

- Educational Expectations: "A greater percentage of former participants (55%) expected to complete at least a four-year college education than did nonparticipants (40%), and expectations were generally higher given longer participation in the program." 2/
- High School Completion: "In general, former UB participants demonstrated no greater high school completion rates than nonparticipants." 3/
- Postsecondary Entry Rates: "The overall postsecondary education entry rate for former UB participants was greater, by almost 20 percentage points, than that of nonparticipants . . .

also, longer participation in the UB program was associated with greater postsecondary education entry rates." [4]

- Types of Postsecondary Institutions Entered: "A greater percentage of former UB participants (66%) reported attending four-year institutions or universities than did nonparticipants (51%)." [5]

- Overall Educational Progress: "The overall educational progress of former UB participants is greater than that of the nonparticipants and is greater with longer participation in the program." [6]

Assuming these general findings apply to the Upward Bound programs on California campuses, then these programs have been successful in responding to the goals of student affirmative action.

Talent Search

The Talent Search program was designed to: (1) identify qualified youths with financial or cultural need and with the potential for success in college and to encourage them to complete high school and enroll in a postsecondary institution; (2) publicize existing forms of student financial aid; and (3) encourage secondary school or college drop-outs who have the potential to reenter educational programs. The goals of projects funded under this program are to reduce the drop-out rate of low-income students, increase the number of drop-outs who return to educational programs, and increase the enrollment of low-income and ethnic minority youths who have delayed pursuing a college education. [7]

Twelve "Talent Search" projects have been established in California, four of them at public institutions: the University of California at Los Angeles and the California State University campuses at Fullerton, Long Beach, and Los Angeles. Total funding for these twelve projects in 1979-80 is approximately $1 million.

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students (SSDS) is a program designed to provide remedial and other special services to students from low-income families who have academic potential but who are hindered because of their educational, cultural, or economic background; physical handicaps; or limited-English-speaking ability. The goal of SSDS projects is to increase the retention and graduation rates of such students enrolled in postsecondary institutions. The program provides academic peer counseling, career counseling, tutoring, and study-skills workshops.

Thirty SSDS projects have been funded in California, and are operating on twenty-seven different college campuses. The University of California, Berkeley; California State University, Sacramento; and East Los Angeles College each have two projects. Statewide, there are SSDS projects on twelve State University campuses, six University campuses, and five Community College campuses. Projects also are being operated by a consortium of Community Colleges in the San Diego area, and by two independent institutions.

The U.S. Office of Education has contracted with System Development Corporation to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of SSDS projects. The primary objective of the evaluation is to

> . . . discover relationships between the extent of student participation in the different types of SSDS activities and the benefits to those students in terms of improved academic performance, increased aspiration levels, greater persistence, and more satisfactory resolutions to financial and other problems that might otherwise interfere with the students' pursuit of postsecondary education. 8/

Initiated in September 1978, the evaluation will be conducted over a period of twenty-eight months.

Educational Opportunity Centers

A fourth important student affirmative action program has established federally funded Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC) in areas with high concentrations of low-income population. This program provides (1) information about financial and academic assistance, (2) assistance in preparing applications for admission to postsecondary institutions and for financial aid, and (3) counseling services and tutorial assistance to students enrolled in postsecondary institutions. While the target group for this program is low-income populations, Educational Opportunity Centers also "serve as recruiting and counseling pools to coordinate resources and staff efforts of institutions of higher education and of other institutions offering programs of postsecondary education, in admitting educationally disadvantaged persons." 9/

Currently, there are twenty-two Educational Opportunity Centers in the nation, two of them in California. A rural outreach effort has been established through the Fresno County Mobile Guidance Educational Projects, Inc. Created in 1969 as a Talent Search project, Mobile Guidance became an Educational Opportunity Center in 1976. With a budget of approximately $200,000, it provided the following services in 1977-78: 88,100 persons received general information; 2,890 received assistance in admissions and financial aid applications; 1,465 received academic career counseling; 202 received tutorial services; and 1,244 received general academic counseling. 10/ An urban-based EOC project has also been established at the Los Angeles campus of the University of California, with a budget of $365,000 in 1977-78.

Community Service Program

Title I-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 authorized federal funding for community service projects designed to expand post-secondary educational opportunities for adults not adequately served by existing educational programs. Under Title I-A a basic grant of $100,000 is awarded annually to each of the fifty states. The remainder of each year's appropriation is distributed on the basis of the adult population of each state. A total of $1.1 million was allocated to California for fiscal year 1979-80, with approximately $550,000 of this amount to be used to support eighteen community service projects. Among the target groups for these projects are older adults, women, ethnic minorities, the physically disabled, and the incarcerated. Seven of these projects are directly related to student affirmative action efforts:

- "West Oakland Community Leadership Consortium" is designed to develop a systematic, advanced leadership training program for people identified as West Oakland leaders (Holy Names College);
- "SOMOS/Concept" is designed to provide persons of Mexican descent with an improved self concept and expanded self esteem (Gavilan College);
- "Continuing Education for Women, Phase III" is designed to help women overcome social and academic barriers inhibiting their educational, vocational, and personal growth (Merced College);
- "Educating Women for Success" is designed to minimize the disparity between women's long-term goals and the method of their attainment (College of Notre Dame);
- "Re-entry Options for Women" is designed to expand the program's existing services by adding a component for more intensive outreach to minority women (Fullerton College);
- "Togawa II Welcome Back" is designed to continue and to improve already established Community Information Centers which serve bilingual and bicultural persons (Mendocino Community College); and

- "People in Transition" is designed to encourage disadvantaged individuals to pursue education and/or skills training, as well as to provide pre-employment counseling, referral services, and career information (College of Marin).

The California Postsecondary Education Commission, which is the agency responsible for administering the Title I-A program in California, has placed considerable emphasis on the establishment of Community Advisement Centers "designed to improve the information, referral, assessment, advisement, and advocacy services available to individuals who want to participate in postsecondary education." 11/ Two Community Advisement Centers were established in March 1979 through the use of Title I-A funds. The Sacramento Center, directed by staff from Cosumnes River College, has targeted its services for adults who are economically disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, disabled persons, displaced homemakers, and elderly adults. The Center in Monterey and San Benito Counties has targeted its services for adult women, ethnic minorities, and low-income peoples. The total funding for these two projects is approximately $364,000.

Education Information Centers

This new federal program, which is similar in many respects to the Title I-A community service programs and the Educational Opportunity Centers discussed above, is funded under Title IV, (Part A, Subpart) of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The program provides grants to states for the cost of planning, establishing, and operating Educational Information Centers (EIC) designed to provide educational information, guidance, counseling, and referral services to individuals, particularly those with cultural or financial barriers, physical handicaps, or educational deficiencies. California has received funds to support the development of a statewide implementation plan, with approximately $100,000 in funding for Centers expected during the 1979-80 fiscal year.

Vocational Education Act

The Vocational Education Act provides for two programs which are part of the student affirmative action effort in California. First, the Act mandates that a portion of the federal funds allocated for "program improvement and supportive services" (Subpart 3) are to be used for national-priority programs--to assist handicapped and disadvantaged persons, and persons who have limited-English-speaking ability, to succeed in regular vocational education programs. The criteria used to determine disadvantaged status are (1) academic [individuals who lack the literary or computative skills needed to function in a democratic society], and (2) economic [individuals whose personal or family circumstances deny them an economically self-sufficient status]. In 1977-78, 304 secondary schools and 70 Community College districts received allocations totaling $8,635,837 for programs and services for disadvantaged vocational students. Approximately 82,000 students were served at the secondary school level, and 94,000 at the Community College level. An example of how these funds are used is provided by the program at Colton Joint Unified School District.

> This program was designed to develop an individualized instructional program to improve the basic skills of the academically and economically disadvantaged students. The basic skills teachers and the vocational education teachers collaborated to design individualized learning programs to help students enrolled in vocational education programs acquire the basic skills they lacked to succeed in their vocational courses. Additional assistance was provided with the use of paraprofessionals and the multimedia laboratory. 12/

A second important program funded under the Act (Subpart 4) is Special Programs for the Disadvantaged. Funds allocated through this program are intended to "assist local education agencies located in areas with high concentrations of youth unemployment or school dropouts to develop, extend, and improve special programs and services for disadvantaged persons enrolled in vocational education." 13/ In 1977-78, 106 secondary school districts and 33 Community College districts in California received allocations totaling $2,039,338. Approximately 5,600 students were served at the secondary school level and 17,600 at the Community College level. Examples of how these funds are utilized are provided by two school districts:

> San Diego City Unified School District. This program was designed to develop remedial programs in basic skills, mathematics, and language arts, so that those students defined as academically disadvantaged could successfully complete their vocational education programs. Teacher assistants used in this program were able to communicate in both English and Spanish. The Mathematics Department used a fully equipped math clinic and computer center. The English Department used a learning center offering individualized programs, allowing the disadvantaged student to succeed in vocational goals.
>
> Los Angeles Unified School District. Two high schools used Subpart 4 funds to hire instructional aides to assist disadvantaged students successfully complete their vocational education programs. At Wilson High School, seven

aides, several of which were bi-lingual in both Spanish and English, assisted disadvantaged students in such programs as child care and development, nursing, drafting, business education, and offset printing. Fremont High School, having a greater number of disadvantaged students, employed 35 instructional aides to assist 769 students in their vocational programs. 14/

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)

An important federal program for the public schools, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title IV-C), provides the opportunity for local educational agencies to develop and field test new models, techniques, strategies, and solutions to current educational problems. More than $4 million was appropriated to California for Fiscal Year 1979-80 to support developmental/innovative projects, adoption projects, exemplary projects, and facilitators projects. While any of these project categories can be directed toward the needs of ethnic minority and/or low-income students, the California State Board of Education has reserved $500,000 for the funding of projects which deal with the preparation of minority students for successful college or university performance. Ten grants have been awarded to educational agencies to develop model programs that effectively address the educational needs of ethnic minority students and are also economically feasible and replicable. The ten projects to be established in 1979-80 are:

1. Butte County Office of Education: "College Bound (CB) Project," to serve 600 students with an annual funding of $60,000;
2. Colton Joint Unified School District: "Project Prep," to serve 200 students with an annual funding of $70,145;
3. Fullerton Union High School District: "A.I.M.," to serve 250 students with an annual funding of $61,178;
4. Los Angeles Unified School District: "High School/University Interaction Program," to serve 450 students with an annual funding of $99,453;
5. Los Angeles Unified School District: "PREP," to serve 743 students with an annual funding of $89,975;
6. Oakland Unified School District: "Oakland Scholars and Achievers College Eligibility Program," to serve 500 students with an annual funding of $71,000;

7. Orange County Department of Education: "Student Capture Opportunities to Redirect Their Education (SCORE)," to serve 600 students with an annual funding of $79,411;

8. Sacramento City Unified School District: "College Headstart Program," to serve 300 students with an annual funding of $67,671;

9. San Diego County Department of Education: "Operation Success: A College Preparatory Program for Minority Secondary Students," to serve 360 students with an annual funding of $73,957; and

10. La Mesa Spring Valley School District: "Interfacing Multi-Cultural Concepts," to serve 1,400 students with an annual funding of $93,868.

PRIVATELY FUNDED PROGRAMS

MESA is the major student affirmative action program in California funded through non-public sources. The purpose of MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement) is to increase the number of underrepresented ethnic minorities in professions related to mathematics, engineering, and the physical sciences. The specific goals of the program are to:

- encourage students from target minority groups to acquire the educational background they need to major in mathematics, engineering, and the physical sciences in college;
- promote career awareness so that participating students may learn of opportunities in the mathematics- and science-related professions early enough to prepare for them; and
- motivate officials from secondary schools, universities, industry, and engineering societies, to cooperate with MESA by offering volunteer time and other vital human and fiscal resources.

The MESA program began in 1970 with twenty-five students at Oakland Technical High School. MESA has since expanded: in 1979-80 it served approximately 1,700 students from the 75 high schools involved in the program. There are currently sixteen MESA Centers throughout California, each center working with 1 to 5 senior high schools and serving from 40 to 200 students. Among the services provided to MESA students are tutoring; academic, university, and career counseling; field trips to industrial plants, research centers, universities, engineering firms, and computer centers;

summer enrichment and employment programs; and scholarship incentive awards. (Students who maintain B averages in advanced-level college preparatory mathematics, science, and English courses earn scholarship support while still in high school.)

MESA centers are located on the following college campuses:

- Capitol--University of California, Davis; and California State University, Sacramento
- East Bay--University of California, Berkeley
- San Jose State University
- Stanford University
- University of California, Santa Barbara
- California State University, Northridge
- University of California, Los Angeles
- University of Southern California
- California State University, Los Angeles
- Harvey Mudd College
- California State University, Long Beach
- University of California, Irvine
- Los Angeles Council of Black Professional Engineers, working cooperatively with Los Angeles Southwest College.
- San Francisco--University of California, San Francisco; and San Francisco State University
- San Diego--University of California, San Diego; and San Diego State University
- Fresno--California State University, Fresno

Funding for the MESA program was $774,000 in 1979-80, with 1,700 students served. Approximately 50 percent of this funding was received from private foundations (the Sloan and the Hewlett Foundations), with 15 percent coming from private industry. The California State University and Colleges received $120,000 in State General Fund assistance for Fiscal Year 1979-80 to facilitate the support and expansion of existing centers on its campuses, as well as the development of new centers on four additional campuses. Similarly, the University of California received $137,000 in State funding for Fiscal Year 1979-80. It is expected that MESA will expand by 1982 to serve approximately 3,000 ethnic minority students throughout California.

STATE FUNDED PROGRAMS

The major State-funded student affirmative action program is the campus-based Educational Opportunity Program. In addition, there are five other important programs supported directly by State funds: the Partnership Program (University of California); the High School and Community College Outreach Program (University of California); the State University/Los Angeles Unified School District Joint Student Affirmative Action Program; the State University's three pilot student affirmative action projects; and the Student Opportunity and Access Program (CAL-SOAP). These postsecondary-level programs are supplemented by two important State-funded programs in the elementary and secondary schools: the School Improvement Program (SIP), and the Demonstration Programs in Reading and Math.

Educational Opportunity Program

Each of the public segments of postsecondary education has developed an extensive "educational opportunity program," which has had a major impact on the enrollment and retention of ethnic minorities and low-income students in California colleges and universities. While the State University and Community College programs are funded by the State, the University program is funded from institutional resources. This section compares the three EOP programs, assesses their impact on ethnic minority students, and identifies problems to be resolved in order to expand the benefits of these programs and to advance student affirmative action goals.

Objectives and Program Components

There is a general similarity of objectives and program components in the EOP effort in each of the three public segments. The University of California's EOP program, begun in 1964-65 by the Regents, has been designed to

> . . . provide access and academic support services for students with demonstrated academic potential who, for socio-economic reasons, might not otherwise have pursued

> higher education; to ensure retention of such students; to increase the number of students from ethnic and economic groups underrepresented in the University; and to increase cultural diversity of the University student enrollment. 15/

The California State University and Colleges' EOP program, established in 1969 by the State, is similarly directed toward the goal of providing access and support for students from low-income/disadvantaged educational backgrounds who have the potential to succeed academically.

> It shall be the purpose of the program to provide educational assistance and grants for undergraduate study at the California State University and Colleges to students who are economically disadvantaged or educationally and economically disadvantaged, but who display potential for success in accredited curricula offered by the California State University and Colleges. 16/

The Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) of the California Community Colleges, also established in 1969 by the State, is directed toward the same goals of recruiting and retaining "students handicapped by language, social and economic disadvantages" and facilitating "their successful participation in the educational pursuits of the college." 17/

The three EOP/S programs also contain the same basic components: identification and admissions, summer orientation or readiness sessions, counseling, tutoring, and financial aid. Each campus-based program has an outreach component to identify and counsel eligible EOP students. While the criteria for admissions eligibility obviously differ among the three segments, EOP staff in each segment provide information and pre-admission counseling to prospective students in the communities immediately surrounding the campus. Several campuses operate summer orientation programs to assist the EOP student in making the transition from high school to college.

Counseling and tutorial services are a crucial part of the effort to retain EOP students. Many EOP programs utilize peer counseling to expand the amount of available counseling services, as well as to provide role models to the EOP student. Financial aid is the last major component of the EOP program, with assistance provided to cover student fees, books, housing, transportation, subsistence, and other incidental expenses.

Major Differences Among Programs

Despite the general similarities in objectives and program components, there are major differences in the EOP/S programs of each segment. These differences relate primarily to (1) degree of systemwide coordination and control, (2) eligibility criteria for participation in the program, (3) income level of students, and (4) sources of funding. Some of these differences, which result primarily from administrative directives rather than statute, cause considerable problems in expanding and improving cooperative efforts between and among the EOP programs of the segments.

- Degree of Systemwide Coordination: In the University, the mandate for the EOP program is developed at the systemwide level, but program implementation is decentralized among the eight campuses. In contrast, the State University and the Community College EOP/S programs receive their mandates and annual funding from the Legislature. The broad shape of the program is defined in statute, with the systemwide office being responsible for implementing the mandate and monitoring local campus programs.

- Eligibility Criteria: The University defines an EOP student as "one who, on being admitted to the University and into the EOP requires one or more of the special services available as an aid in realizing his/her educational goals." 18/ Currently, about 70 percent of the new EOP students are academically qualified for regular admission to the University, and therefore qualify for EOP on criteria other than educational disadvantage alone. (This represents an important change in the University program during the past five years, since in 1970 about 70 percent of the new EOP students were not qualified for regular admission.) To illustrate, in Fall 1974, approximately 64 percent of the new EOP students were enrolled under regular admissions standards, with these students having a mean high school GPA of 3.55 and a mean SAT score of 860. 19/

  In contrast, the State University EOP program has placed primary emphasis on identifying and enrolling "high potential" students who are not academically eligible for regular admission. The EOP program is essentially an admissions and support program for academically "high risk" students. To illustrate, in Fall 1975, the mean high school GPA for freshman EOP students at the State University was 2.47, compared to 3.14 for regularly admitted freshman students. 20/

  Eligibility criteria for the Community College EOPS program are primarily economic. Title 5 of the California Administrative Code states that EOPS students cannot have a family income greater than $7,500 for a family of four, $6,600 for a family of three, or $5,700 for a family of two. Efforts to identify EOPS students concentrate on students already enrolled at the Community Colleges as well as students in the high schools. On the basis of their high school grade point averages, Community College EOPS students are not as academically disadvantaged as the EOP student attending the State University. 21/

- Income Level of EOP Students: The majority of dependent students in the State University EOP program report parental incomes in the $5,000-$10,000 range, while more than 65 percent of the dependent students in the University EOP program report parental incomes in the $5,000-$15,000 range. Apparently, the reported parental income for Community College EOPS students is significantly lower, with annual mean parental income less than $6,000.

- Source of Funding: The EOP/S programs in both the State University and the Community Colleges are funded through annual appropriations from the State General Fund. In contrast, the University EOP program is supported by Regents' funds, plus faculty, student, and outside contributions.

Growth of EOP/S

The three educational opportunity programs have experienced a dramatic growth since their founding. At the University of California, the EOP program grew from an initial enrollment of 100 students in 1964-65 to over 8,700 students in 1975-76, with a budget of approximately $22 million. The California State University and Colleges' EOP program expanded from an enrollment of 3,150 students in 1969-70 to 20,774 students in 1978-79, with a budget of approximately $12 million. The EOP/S program at the California Community Colleges has had a similarly rapid rate of growth, expanding from 13,943 students in 1969-70 to more than 57,000 students in 1978-79, with an annual budget of approximately $17.4 million.

The level of funding for each of the programs has increased annually at approximately the same annual rate from 1969-70 to 1975-76. 22/ During the past three years, however, there has been a dramatic expansion of the State University and the Community College EOP/S programs, particularly the latter. Funding for the Community College EOPS program increased by $10 million from 1975-76 to 1978-79, while funding for the State University program increased by $5.5 million during the same three-year period. 23/

79

TABLE III-1

FUNDING HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA'S EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

	University of California		State University and Colleges		Community Colleges	
Year	Total Program Cost	Base Number	Total Program Cost	Base Number	Total Program Cost	Base Number
1969-70	$ 7,919,293	100	$ 2,400,269	100	$ 2,870,000	100
1970-71	10,239,000	129	3,347,954	139	4,350,000	152
1971-72	12,855,000	162	1,662,442	69	3,350,000	117
1972-73	13,887,000	175	3,630,868	151	4,850,000	169
1973-74	13,640,000	172	5,006,303	209	6,170,500	215
1974-75	17,118,000	216	5,005,179	209	6,170,500	215
1975-76	21,859,000	276	6,464,138	269	7,654,879	267
1976-77	24,888,555	314	9,672,991	403	11,484,027	400
1977-78	26,568,088	335	11,156,888	465	13,983,157	487
1978-79			11,022,713	459	17,389,919	606
1979-80 (est.)			12,602,984	525	20,472,092	713

NOTE: Data are not available for the University of California's Educational Opportunity Program for 1978-79 and 1979-80.

#53-mj/124
rev. 8/23/79

TABLE III-2

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

	Students Served	Number of Grants	Total Grant Dollars	Total Administration and Counseling Costs	Total Program Costs
1969-70			$1,228,130	$1,172,139	$ 2,400,269
1970-71			1,934,000	1,413,954	3,347,954
1971-72			350,000	1,312,442	1,662,442
1972-73		6,300	2,156,000	1,474,868	3,630,868
1973-74		9,534	3,198,918	1,807,385	5,006,303
1974-75		9,251	3,061,455	1,943,724	5,005,179
1975-76		11,698	4,263,433	2,200,705	6,464,138
1976-77	12,514	8,050	6,069,467	3,603,524	9,672,991
1977-78	13,545	9,885	6,782,130	4,374,758	11,156,888
1978-79	13,799	8,249	6,558,575	4,464,138	11,022,713
1979-80 (est.)	13,221	9,839	6,825,710	5,777,274	12,602,984

#53-mj/123
rev. 5/21/79

TABLE III-3

THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES' EXTENDED OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

	Total Number of Students	Dollars for Administration	Dollars for Financial Aid	Dollars for Education Support	Dollars for Planning and Special Projects	Total EOPS Dollars
1969-70	13,943					$ 2,870,000
1970-71	19,725					4,350,000
1971-72	19,459					3,350,000
1972-73	19,800					4,850,000
1973-74	25,083					6,170,500
1974-75	23,917					6,170,500
1975-76	27,149	$ 459,360	$4,466,081	$2,679,602	$ 49,836	7,654,879
1976-77	40,724	1,039,830	5,737,537	4,637,756	68,904	11,484,027
1977-78	48,679	1,258,484	6,390,303	6,250,471	83,899	13,983,157
1978-79	57,392	1,388,920	7,912,449	7,738,550	350,000	17,389,919
1979-80 (est.)	64,391	1,562,642	9,297,300	9,221,489	390,661	20,472,092

#53-mj/125
4/9/79

Impact on Ethnic Minority Students

The three EOP programs have been a major factor in the enrollment and retention of ethnic minorities in California's public institutions. In the University of California during 1975-76, 70 percent of all Black undergraduate students were dependent on EOP support services, financial aid, and tutoring. During the same year, 64 percent of all Chicano undergraduates and 61 percent of all American Indian undergraduates were EOP enrollees. At the California State University and Colleges in Fall 1975, approximately 35 percent of all Chicano and Black undergraduates were in the EOP program. The California Community Colleges demonstrate the same general pattern as that found in the State University and Colleges. Clearly, without the services provided by the EOP programs, ethnic minority enrollments would be significantly lower.

Given the importance of the Educational Opportunity Programs as a source of minority student enrollment, any decrease in the number of EOP students necessarily results in a decrease in the number of minority students. For example, during the past five years there has been a decrease in the number of Black undergraduates enrolled at the University. This trend is apparently the result of a decrease in the number of Black students within that segment's EOP program. While there were 2,810 Black EOP students in 1972-73, the number had decreased to 2,425 in 1975-76. 24/ The Berkeley and the Los Angeles campuses, particularly the former, have been the primary sources of this drop in Black EOP enrollment.

By contrast, the number of Chicano EOP students in the University increased by approximately 50 percent from 1970-71 to 1975-76. 25/ The only campus with a decrease in Chicano EOP students during that six-year period was Berkeley. While the reasons are not evident, the number of Black and Chicano EOP students at that campus decreased by 45 percent and 21 percent, respectively, during the same period, although total EOP funding at the Berkeley campus increased by approximately 50 percent from 1970-71 to 1975-76.

Within the State University, Black students have the largest EOP representation. More than 40 percent of the new EOP enrollees each year since 1973-74 have been Black. Chicano students are the next largest group, with slightly more than 30 percent. This finding is particularly significant: while Chicanos represent the largest minority group within California, they are the most underrepresented minority group in the State University.

TABLE III-4

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
PERCENT ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF NEW EOP ENROLLEES

	Nat. Amer.	Blk	Chicano	Latin/ Amer.	Asian	White	Filipino	All Others	Total
1973-74	3.7%	44.0%	34.0%	1.5%	5.3%	6.7%	.0%	4.8%	100%
1974-75	2.5	45.9	33.1	1.7	4.1	6.7	.8	5.2	100
1975-76	2.6	39.9	30.1	1.3	5.0	12.6	2.0	6.5	100
1976-77	2.1	42.9	31.8	2.2	5.6	9.8	1.8	3.3	100

Source: California State University and Colleges' EOP Data Base.

The services provided by the EOP programs apparently have been effective in enabling educationally disadvantaged students to stay in college. While the number of good evaluative studies of EOP support programs have been limited, a recent State University study concluded that "in terms of conventional indices such as GPA, units earned, and retention rates, a significant majority of EOP students have succeeded in the college environment." 26/ This conclusion is particularly significant because the State University EOP program is intended primarily for academically "high risk" students who have had inadequate preparation for college-level work. The academic performance of EOP students during their freshman year was comparable to that for regularly admitted students: 81.2 percent of the EOP freshman students completed the first year, as compared to 82.6 percent of the regular students. A large number of EOP students dropped out during the sophomore year, when the extensive support services are less available. The persistence rate for EOP students dropped to 48.6 percent at the end of the second year, compared to 59.6 percent for the regular students. As might be expected, EOP students had a lower college grade-point average (GPA) than the regular students. However, when comparing the grade-point differential between high school and college, EOP students had a smaller decline in college GPA at the end of the first year than regularly admitted freshmen.

The evaluation of the State University EOP program concluded with the following observation:

> EOP has made it possible for a significant number of students not traditionally predicted to succeed in college to go to college and, in frequent instances, to excel. Thus,

> as an access program, EOP seems very effective in identifying, selecting and admitting students with sufficient unmeasured academic potential and motivation to do well. On the average, EOP students may not perform at the same level as regularly admitted non-EOP students, but it is probably unrealistic to expect to compensate totally for sixteen to eighteen years of disadvantaged academic experience with a year of motivational counseling and learning assistance.
>
> EOP's assistance function is more difficult to assess. There are anecdotal and survey data which indicate that EOP students generally believe that EOP services contribute to their success in college. In terms of quantifiable data, the expected decrease in first-year GPA for EOP students is less than that for both Comparable Ethnic and Regular students . . . The effect of EOP's assistance function is . . . likewise demonstrated by comparable retention rates for the first year between EOP and non-EOP students. 27/

This optimistic conclusion should be compared with more disappointing data from a second State University report 28/, which concluded that only 8.8 percent of the first-time freshmen admitted through the disadvantaged/exceptional admit category in Fall 1973, had graduated with a baccalaureate degree within five years. By contrast, 33.0 percent of regularly admitted freshmen had graduated within the same time period. Data concerning transfer students are even more disappointing. While 36.4 percent of those regularly admitted in Fall 1975 had graduated within three years after enrolling, only 8.5 percent of those admitted under the disadvantaged exception category had graduated. It seems apparent that a thorough evaluation study of EOP support programs is needed in order to determine their effectiveness in enabling educationally disadvantaged students to complete their undergraduate program in a timely fashion.

The EOP programs have had an important, indirect influence in increasing enrollments of ethnic minority students. In the State University, for example, the EOP program is generally for students who are not admissible under regular admissions requirements. During the process of identifying and recruiting eligible EOP students, many ethnic minority students who are not eligible for EOP are identified and recruited for regular admission to the State University. Consequently, the State University EOP program has been an effective recruiter for non-EOP ethnic minority students. This situation is not as prevalent at the University since its EOP program is generally for regularly admissible students.

PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED

Despite the positive results achieved by the segmental EOP programs during the past ten years, many important problems must still be resolved in order to expand the benefits from this statewide effort. Some of these problems were identified previously in the lengthy report prepared by the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI) of Los Angeles. 29/ Of particular importance are the following:

- There is little systematic coordination among EOP/S staffs at the different campuses within the same geographical region. Although the EOP program within each segment is serving essentially the same type of student, there is a lack of concerted effort by EOP staff to share information about prospective students with the EOP staffs at nearby campuses in a different segment. There are some examples of successful cooperative efforts on the part of EOP/S programs--e.g., the South Coast EOP/S Consortium--but they are the exception rather than the rule.

- As noted earlier, the EOP program at the State University is intended primarily for "high risk" students who are not eligible for regular admission. Consequently, EOPS students who seek to transfer to a State University campus after completing the first two years of academic work at a Community College are generally not eligible for the EOP program since they meet regular admissions criteria. Therefore, many EOPS students who need academic support services not only encounter difficulty in transferring to a State University campus, but also in completing the baccalaureate program.

  Ironically, if a Community College EOPS student transfers to the State University at the end of one academic year, that student is eligible for the financial and academic support provided by the EOP program. However, the "academically disadvantaged" EOPS student who is successful at a Community College loses his or her eligibility for EOP support services at the State University. Nonetheless, Community Colleges EOPS directors generally advise students to remain at the two-year institutions until they complete the requirements for the associate degree.

- The outreach component of the EOP/S programs is generally the same in all segments, and on all the campuses. While there are differences among campuses in the extent of effort, the process of identification and counseling is basically the same. Among college campuses within the same region, there is some duplication of effort and inefficiency, however, in the use of resources in identifying and counseling students from target high schools.

- On some campuses there is a lack of support for the EOPS program on the part of the faculty and the administration. The study by the Evaluation and Training Institute reported that several programs "were characterized by an unsupportive administration, a lack of EOP/EOPS representation on campus policy-making bodies, poor facilities isolated from the mainstream of the campus, and the existence of a vocal and powerful group of non-supportive faculty." 30/

- On many campuses there is still a stigma attached to being an EOP/S student according to the ETI study. This appears to be particularly true in the State University, where the EOP program emphasizes the enrollment of "high risk" students ineligible for regular admission. At these institutions "a small but significant portion of the faculty are still suspicious of 'EOP-types' who will 'lower the standards,' despite the evidence that EOP/EOPS students perform as well academically as their non-EOP/EOPS counterparts." 31/ Because some high school counselors accept this notion, they advise students to avoid EOP/S programs--students who might benefit greatly from such academic support services.

- The success of EOP/S programs in increasing minority enrollments has generally meant that all issues relating to ethnic minorities are considered the province of EOP/S programs and staffs. The responsibility to respond to the legitimate academic needs of ethnic minority students has thereby been shifted from the faculty and administration to the campus EOP/S director in general, and his or her staff in particular. In short, the existence and the success of the EOP/S program has enabled many faculty members and administrators to ignore the issue of student affirmative action by arguing that all educational problems experienced by ethnic minority students should be resolved by the EOP staff.

- The rapid growth in the EOP/S program during the past ten years (and the corresponding increase in the number of academically disadvantaged students) has not been accompanied by a corresponding change and adjustment in the methods and content of instruction. This point was made in the ETI study, whose authors argued that faculty are generally

  > . . .not trained in the most effective ways of teaching or evaluating their instructional competence for students generally. Their lack is even more evident when teaching students who are the products of deprived academic backgrounds or have learning problems or disabilities . . .. Institutions must take more responsibility for providing the kind of

> staff development programs that will enable the faculty to be more effective, both in terms of instructional competence and curricular development. Other than the development of Ethnic Studies programs in a number of schools, no essential changes in the college curriculum occurred in response to or in conjunction with EOP/EOPS or other programs for the disadvantaged." 32/

While some colleges did try to sensitize faculty to the needs of ethnic minority students and to incorporate new modes of instruction into the curriculum, information has not been gathered to determine how effective and extensive these efforts have been. Moreover, given the changing ethnic composition of the student body, there is clearly an increased need for programs of this type.

- The administrative experience of EOP directors is not generally regarded as traditional administrative experience within the University, and there usually is no clear career ladder for EOP staff. As a result, EOP directors frequently have limited opportunities for professional advancement on the campus beyond their current position.

- Despite the substantial increase in federal and State funding for student financial assistance programs during the past four years, it is necessary to determine (1) if the full range of financial aid opportunities is being utilized by EOP programs to respond to the needs of students, (2) if there is a need for improved coordination between the EOP and the financial aid offices on each campus, and (3) if the complexity of the financial aid process has inhibited the use of these programs by EOP students.

The University's Partnership Program

The University of California started the Partnership Program in 1976 to assist low-income and ethnic minority students in grades seven through nine to begin preparing themselves for a college education. The general problem to which this program is responding is the low eligibility rate of minority students for admission to the University. More specifically, the following three problems have been identified:

(1) The Algebra/Geometry series required for admission to the University has proven to be a major obstacle for many minority students in attaining eligibility. Many students are not encouraged by their teachers and counselors to

take these courses or are eliminated at the pre-algebra or 8th and 9th grade algebra stage by low grades.

(2) Insufficient science and English coursework preparation is also a severe problem. Therefore, many minority and low-income students are not receiving the necessary training for these high school college-prep courses.

(3) Parental attitudes about college, combined with a lack of information about higher education in general, further complicate the problem. 33/

In response to these problems, the University decided to initiate intensive motivational and counseling programs at selected, target intermediate schools. The basic student services provided by the program include counseling (both small-group and individual); role-model presentations by University faculty, staff and students; multi-media presentations; tours of nearby University campuses; and printed information for students, parents, and school staff.

Approximately 10,000 students in 250 intermediate schools were served by the Partnership Program in 1978-79. The basic criteria used for selecting students has been:

1. enrollment in seventh, eighth, or ninth grade;
2. minority and/or low-income background;
3. potential to benefit from the program and its activities;
4. potential to achieve at a level which would result in University eligibility upon graduation from high school; and
5. desire to participate in the program. 34/

During 1977-78, the program was expanded to include over 175 intermediate schools and approximately 9,900 students. The funding history for this program is summarized in the following table:

TABLE III-5

UC PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUNDING HISTORY

1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
$54,000	$462,000	$1,162,000	$1,010,000	$1,280,000

The University provided the financial support for this program during its initial two years. Beginning in 1977-78, support has been shared by the State General Fund (55%) and the University (45%).

The University's Partners Program

The University of California started the Partners Program in 1979, to meet the needs of ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade students who have been involved with the Partnership Program. The Partners Program is structured to pick up students once they leave the Partnership Program and continue to support and assist them toward a successful completion of high school. Each of the eight University campuses has a professional staff member assigned to coordinate services with participating high schools. By virtue of the fact that the program serves only former Partnership students, the school selection criteria narrows to a determination of which high schools these students are attending:

Students participating in the University Partners program receive the following basic services:

1. Academic counseling;
2. Role model presentations;
3. Academic tutoring; and
4. Tours of local college campuses.

In 1979-80, the Partners Program received a total of $550,000 in funds. The financial support for this program is shared by the State General Fund (55%) and the University (45%).

The University's Immediate Outreach Program

The University of California started the Immediate Outreach Program in 1976 to provide campuses with sufficient resources to seek out and assist regularly qualified ethnic minority high school seniors in immediate application to the University. Each campus is assigned two professional staff members who coordinate activities designed to attract students to the University. These activities include summer transition programs for incoming students, campus tours and visits, and academic orientation seminars. In addition, these staff members are responsible for carrying admission, financial aid and academic information to the targeted high schools.

TABLE III-6

UC IMMEDIATE OUTREACH PROGRAM FUNDING HISTORY

1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
$292,000	$292,000	$312,000	$762,000	$372,000

The University provided the financial support for this program during its initial two years. Beginning in 1977-78, support has been shared by the State General Fund (55%) and the University (45%).

The University's Academic Enrichment Programs

The 1978-79 Budget Act provided support to the University for the establishment of "MESA-like" projects on four campuses. These projects, entitled Academic Enrichment Programs, were established on the Davis, Berkeley, Santa Barbara, and Irvine campuses during summer 1979, each with approximately $45,000 in funding. The program on the Davis campus will be a cooperative effort between the three undergraduate colleges (Letters and Science, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and Engineering) and will be coordinated with the existing MESA program. The primary goal of the program is to improve the academic preparation of high school ethnic minority students in computation and written-communication skills. Program components include academic advising, career counseling, academic tutorials; field trips to research centers, universities, and scientific laboratories; and scholarship incentives. The primary target group for this program is made up of high school students who have been involved in the University's Partnership Program. The total budget for this program in 1979-80 will be $45,000.

The goal of the Academic Enrichment Program (AEP) on the Berkeley campus is to increase the number of minority high school students academically prepared for and interested in applying to the School of Business or the Department of Economics. The program will be coordinated with the MESA project on the Berkeley campus, and will target three or four senior high schools in the Bay Area. The Santa Barbara AEP program will encourage and support high school students of minority background in their study of college-preparatory courses emphasizing mathematics, English, and the arts. The program's summer session will include jobs at cooperating local companies and educational opportunities in the form of enrichment courses at the University. The school-year session will include academic and career counseling, field trips, tutoring, and incentive awards. Approximately 210 students from three high schools will be served by the program.

The Academic Enrichment Program at the University of California, Irvine, campus will focus on two separate disciplinary areas--computer science/mathematics and humanities/fine arts. Students participate in an intensive three-day summer orientation which presents the academic material. During the school year, students meet weekly at their high school campuses and monthly at the Irvine campus. Academic-year activities include field trips, guest lectures, continuing academic instruction in the disciplines introduced during the summer, tutoring in appropriate academic areas, and information and advice on financial aid opportunities. The five target schools are in Garden Grove, Long Beach, and Santa Ana, with a total of approximately 150 students participating in the program. These students will be selected from among past participants in the Partnership Program.

State University's Three Pilot Projects

The 1978-79 Budget Act provided support for pilot outreach efforts by State University campuses. Initially, two projects were funded at Fresno and Dominguez Hills, with a third added later at San Jose. The primary emphasis of each of these pilot projects is to experiment with nontraditional outreach approaches. According to the Chancellor's Office, "these campuses were selected on a competitive basis from campus proposals, with special emphasis placed on new concepts and appropriateness for campus service area." 35/

> Dominguez Hills Campus: The primary objective is to increase the enrollment of Chicano and Pacific Island students from the communities of Wilmington, San Pedro, and Carson through extensive involvement in "other than school settings" such as social, religious, recreational, and cultural organizations.

Fresno Campus: The primary objective is to increase the enrollment of Chicano students from the northern San Joaquin Valley through contact with parents and prospective students at community and high school cultural programs of ethnic theatre, dance, music and art. Emphasis is placed on the in-depth involvement of parents in the outreach effort.

San Jose Campus: The primary objective is to increase the enrollment of Chicano and Black students by working with three local high schools in "(1) pre-admission college counseling for seniors, (2) early identification and tutoring for 7-10 grade prospective students, and (3) monitoring and assisting students through the procedures of applying for admission and financial aid." 36/ Supplementary activities include field trips to campuses, workshops on study skills, and special departmental presentations.

The annual appropriation for these three pilot projects has been approximately $130,000, with the State General Fund providing full support.

State University/Los Angeles Unified School District Program

A task force consisting of staff members from the Chancellor's Office and from the Los Angeles Unified School District met during 1978 to plan for a joint student affirmative action program designed to "raise the aspirations of minority/low-income students, attract and prepare such students for college, and recruit, train, and place bilingual teachers." 37/ This program involves four basic components: (1) a regional advisory group with representatives from the high schools, Community Colleges, and the State University, which has the responsibility to "coordinate and deploy available resources to meet most effectively the needs of the regions" 38/; (2) paraprofessional outreach to high schools, with trained college students assisting professional staff; (3) extensive involvement of parents in the outreach effort; and (4) counselor in-service training programs designed to develop workshop models and materials which will provide relevant and accurate information to counselors to increase their awareness of the needs of ethnic minority students. Approximately $400,000 in State funding was provided for this program in 1979-80. The Chancellor's Office also received $200,000 in State funds to establish a similar program in two other regions during 1979-80, with both of these programs to be in rural areas.

Community College EOPS Student Summer Internship Program

The EOPS Student Summer Internship Program is an intensive 10-week live-in experience, wherein Community College EOPS students are given an opportunity to gain work experience in a State agency, learn about the legislative process from key legislators, and receive six upper division units from courses taken at California State University, Sacramento.

In its initial year (1978), the program was funded at $26,793 and served twelve students selected from throughout the State. During 1979, the project served twenty students and operated on a budget of $50,300. Sixty percent of the funding was spent on direct services to students.

Program support for 1979 is summarized as follows: the Community Colleges EOPS Special Projects grant covered all the administrative costs and two-thirds of the direct student costs ($40,300); the EOPS project at each student's home campus contributed $500 ($10,000 total); key legislators contributed their time to the project; State agencies provided the work experience; and California State University, Sacramento, provided staff support in designing curriculum, acquiring instructors, classroom space and the housing contract.

California Student Opportunity and Access Program

In 1978, the Legislature approved and the Governor signed Assembly Bill 507 (Chapter 113, Statutes of 1978, Fazio), which provided $250,000 for the development of at least five cooperative, inter-institutional projects to increase the enrollment of low-income students in postsecondary institutions. Funds for this program, called the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (CAL-SOAP) were to be administered by the Student Aid Commission, with advice from a fifteen-member Advisory Committee. To be eligible for funding, each project was expected to include at least three institutions, one of which must be a Community College. The legislation also required that at least one project be established in a rural area, and that at least one project involve an independent institution.

The five projects selected by the Student Aid Commission to receive CAL-SOAP funding are:

- Central Coast EOP/S Consortium--Higher Education Learning Project (HELP): Project HELP is a cooperative program in Santa Clara County which involves three high schools, three Community Colleges, University of California at Santa Cruz, San Jose State University, and one community agency (the Santa Clara County Chapter of the National Alliance of Business). The project is designed to provide motivational and academic assistance for 200 high school students and 100 Community College students.

- Educational Guidance Center Consortium: This project, which involves the cooperative efforts of fifteen high schools and four Community Colleges in the East Bay area, is a major expansion of the Educational Guidance Center, a program sponsored by the Stiles Hall-University of California YMCA. The Consortium expects to serve the informational and academic needs of 3,000 high school and Community College students in the East Bay communities of Richmond, Berkeley, Oakland, and Union City.

- San Diego County CAL-SOAP Consortium: The objectives of the Consortium are to streamline and coordinate all major, educationally related services to low-income students in San Diego County. Virtually all secondary and postsecondary institutions in the County are participants, as are a number of civic and community organizations.

- Solano University and Community College Educational Support Services Consortium (SUCCESS): The Consortium is a combined effort of all secondary and postsecondary institutions in Solano County to increase the college-going rate of low-income students. The Consortium will provide academic and informational services to 192 high school students and 64 Community College students in the County. Participants will come from Benicia, Vacaville, Dixon, Winters, Vallejo, and Fairfield-Suisun.

- South Coast EOP/S Consortium--Student Opportunity and Access Program: This project constitutes a significant expansion of services offered by the South Coast EOP/S Consortium. Approximately 5,000 students from Orange County will be served under the new program, some on a strictly informational basis and others on both an academic and motivational basis. The service population is approximately 60 percent Chicano and 10 percent Black, and the bulk of the services are directed to students in the communities of Whittier and Costa Mesa.

School Improvement Program

The School Improvement Program (SIP), authorized by Chapter 894, Statutes of 1977, was designed to restructure and improve the educational program in California's elementary and secondary schools. The enabling legislation stated that

> . . . the Legislature recognizes that a wide variety of factors such as low family income, pupil transiency rates, and large numbers of homes where a primary language other than English is spoken have a direct impact on a child's success in school and personal development, and require that different levels of financial assistance be provided districts in order to assure a quality level of education for all pupils . . ..

The Superintendent of Public Instruction was directed to make apportionments to school districts to fund programs for pupils who qualify economically and educationally. Approximately $120 million has been appropriated for this program each year since its inception in 1977-78, with approximately 95 percent of the funds directed to elementary schools. The Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE) at the University of California, Los Angeles, will conduct and evaluate the program over a five-year period, from 1977-78 through 1981-82.

Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics

The Department of Education was authorized, through Chapter 1596, Statutes of 1969, to establish cost-effective demonstration programs of intensive instruction in reading and mathematics designed to improve the academic attainment of low-achieving seventh-,through ninth-grade students in the State's most concentrated areas of poverty. The demonstration projects are "aimed solely at the development of above-average competency in basic skills among students . . . who otherwise might be expected to have difficulty achieving success in high school." 39/ Approximately 10,000 students have been served annually by this program during each of the past three years, with approximately $3 million in funding provided annually. Among the important elements of this program are: 40/

- All students at the project grade level participate in the demonstration program at the school. The project moves with the students, serving them throughout grades seven, eight, and nine.

- Components of the program frequently include individualized instruction, use of teacher's aides in the classroom, learning centers or laboratories, and specially designed curricula, materials, and activities.

- All continuing demonstration programs include activities designed to disseminate information and materials about the program to other schools.

- The projects deemed least effective on the basis of student achievement and cost effectiveness are terminated, with funds from such programs used to establish programs in other schools and in other eligible districts.

The Legislative Analyst will provide an extended review of the Demonstration Programs in his Analysis of the 1980-81 State Budget, in order to provide the needed evaluation prior to the expiration of the programs' authorization in September 1981.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

There are a multitude of student affirmative action programs on college and university campuses in California. It is necessary to develop a complete inventory of these programs in order to: (1) develop a more coordinated effort among campuses within the same region, (2) identify areas where new programs are needed, and (3) identify areas where the number of existing programs can be reduced in order to utilize limited financial resources more effectively. The inventory provided in the appendix classifies the programs by target group and primary purpose, using fifteen categories:.

1. Programs to motivate junior and high school students to improve these academic skills;

2. Programs to recruit eligible high school students;

3. Programs to motivate students to pursue professions in which minorities are underrepresented;

4. Programs to assist students in their transition from secondary to postsecondary institutions;

5. Programs to reduce identified financial barriers;

6. Programs to increase the retention of undergraduate students;

7. Programs to assist ethnic minorities in planning careers;

8. Programs to recruit and retain Chicano students;
9. Programs to recruit and retain American Indian students;
10. Programs to recruit and retain Indo-Chinese students;
11. Faculty development and/or involvement programs;
12. Programs to assist adult women in their transition to postsecondary institutions;
13. Programs to provide information about educational alternatives for adults who are not enrolled in an educational institution;
14. Programs to provide adults with skills to function more effectively in society;
15. Programs to motivate high school women to pursue careers in which women are underrepresented.

This inventory includes all of the identified campus-based programs in operation during 1978-79 in the three public segments of postsecondary education. The three systemwide EOP/S programs are included in Table III-7 as a separate type of program, since they have two or more major program purposes. Programs which operate on more than one campus (such as the University's Partnership Program and the MESA Program) are listed as one program. The following summary table (Table III-7) aggregates the data presented in the inventory, and provides the basis for the following generalizations:

- In addition to the EOP/S programs which exist on all public college campuses, 134 separate campus-based student affirmative action programs were identified in California. These programs received approximately $11.2 million in funding in 1978-79. If the three systemwide EOP programs are included, total funding for campus-based student affirmative action programs in 1978-79 was approximately $62.4 million.

- All of the campuses of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, and of most of the California Community Colleges, have at least two, and in most cases, three, student affirmative action programs.

- Only 6 of the 137 campus-based student affirmative action programs in operation in 1978-79 involved formal cooperation among public postsecondary institutions within the same region. Two of these programs were designed to motivate students to pursue professions in which minorities are underrepresented--

TABLE III-7

CAMPUS-BASED STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS
1978-79

Type of Program	Number of Programs	Approximate Total Amount of Funding (000's)	Number with Intersegmental Component	Number Utilizing Peer Personnel	Number with Faculty Involvement	Number with Involvement of Parents	Number Using Role Models	Number with Involvement of Private Industry
Programs to motivate 7-12 grade students to improve their academic skills	23	$4,191.5 25% State 75% federal	0	23	22	23	22	0
Programs to recruit eligible high school students	12	$610.7 75% federal 25% State/ institutional	0	10	2	3	3	0
Programs to motivate students to pursue professions wherein minorities are under-represented	11	$584.8 3% institutional 30% federal 67% private	2	1	8	1	3	5
Programs to assist in the transition from secondary to post-secondary institutions	5	$160.3 62.4% federal 32.6% State 5% institutional	0	0	1	0	0	1
Programs to reduce perceived financial barriers	1	n/a	0	0	1	0	0	0
Programs to increase the retention of undergraduate students	31	$2,888.6 100% federal	1	31	0	0	0	0
Programs to assist ethnic minorities with career planning	2	n/a	0	0	1	0	1	1
Programs to recruit and retain Chicano students	1	n/a	0	0	1	0	0	0
Programs to recruit and retain American Indian students	5	$328.6 75% federal 9% institutional 16% State	0	1	1	0	0	0
Programs to Recruit and Retain Indo-Chinese students	1	$198 100% federal	0	0	1	0	0	0

#53-mj/131a
rev. 6/4/79

TABLE III-7

CAMPUS-BASED STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

Type of Program	Number of Programs	Approximate Total Amount of Funding (000's)	Number with Intersegmental Component	Number Utilizing Peer Personnel	Number with Faculty Involvement	Number with Involvement of Parents	Number Using Role Models	Number with Involvement of Private Industry
Faculty development and/or involvement programs	2	$55.3 100% institutional	0	0	2	0	0	0
Programs to assist adult women in the transition to post-secondary educational institutions	23	$325.9 10% federal 90% institutional	0	1	4	0	0	0
Programs to provide information about educational alternatives for adults not enrolled in an educational institution	9	$1,294.1 20% institutional 80% federal	3	6	2	0	1	0
Programs to provide adults with skills to function more effectively in society	8	$526.4 94% federal 6% State/ institutional	0	2	1	0	0	0
Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP and EOPs)	3	$51,215.0 60% State 30% Institutional	0	1	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	137	$62.379.4	6	76	47	27	30	7

#53-mj/131b
rev. 7/24/79

MESA and the Health Careers Opportunity Program (Canada College). One of the programs, the EOPS Summer Internship Program, was designed to increase the retention of undergraduate students and facilitate the transfer of EOPS students to a four-year institution. The other three programs were designed to provide information about educational alternatives for adults not enrolled in an educational institution--the Educational Opportunity Centers in Los Angeles and in Fresno, and the Community Advisement Centers for Monterey/San Benito Counties and Sacramento County.

- Of the 137 campus-based student affirmative action programs in operation in 1978-79, 7 included the involvement of individuals from private industry. Five of these programs were designed to motivate students to pursue professions in which minorities are underrepresented--MESA; Minority Introduction to Engineering (UC, Los Angeles; UC, Irvine; and CSU, Northridge); and Bridges to Business (CSU, San Diego).

- The three segmental EOP/S programs constitute the major student affirmative action effort in California. In addition to these three, however, the types of programs which have received the greatest emphasis in terms of funding, are those designed to (1) motivate junior and senior high school students to improve their academic skills, and (2) increase the persistence of undergraduate students. Those in the second category are primarily federally funded and (with three exceptions) are programs funded under Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, one of the Trio programs. Funding of programs in the first category is shared by the federal government (75%), and the State (25%).

- The major funding for programs designed to assist adult women in the transition to postsecondary education is provided by the colleges; only 10 percent comes from government (federal).

- There is little evidence to indicate that the student affirmative action programs administered by the public institutions and directed toward students in the secondary schools are being coordinated with similar programs administered by the State Department of Education. For example, the Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics for students in junior and senior high school from low-income areas are apparently not linked with outreach and early outreach programs directed by postsecondary institutions.

FOOTNOTES

1/ *Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A First Follow-Up*, Research Triangle Institute (Final Report 22U-889), North Carolina, September 1977.

2/ *Ibid*., p. XVII.

3/ *Ibid*., p. XVIII.

4/ *Ibid*., p. XVIII.

5/ *Ibid*., pp. XVIII-XIX.

6/ *Ibid*., p. XX.

7/ *Federal Register*, Vol. 24, No. 100--Tuesday, May 24, 1977, Title 45, Chapter 1, Part 159.1.

8/ "A Study of Special Services for Disadvantaged Students," prepared by System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

9/ "Applications for Grants Under Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds," Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., October 1977, p. A3.

10/ "Rural Outreach," in *Focus*: *National Newsletter for Higher Education*, First Quarter, 1979, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 2.

11/ "Call for Submission of Preliminary Proposals Under Title I-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, University Community Services," Memorandum from Patrick M. Callan to Presidents of Institutions of Higher Education, May 17, 1978.

12/ "Training for Nontraditional Occupations," California Annual Vocational Education Accountability Report for 1977-78, State Department of Education, p. 12.

13/ *Ibid*., p. 13.

14/ *Ibid*., p. 13.

15/ *Report of the University of California Educational Opportunity Programs*, *1973-74*, Office of the President, March 5, 1975.

16/ *Education Code*, Title 3, Division 5, Part 42, Section 69620. The program was established by Senate Bill 1072, Chapter 1336, Statutes of 1969.

17/ *Education Code*, Title 3, Division 5, Part 42, Section 69641. This program was established by Senate Bill 164, Chapter 1579, Statutes of 1969.

18/ *Report on the University of California Educational Opportunity Program, 1972-73*, Office of the President, February 6, 1974.

19/ See *Access and Assistance: The Study of EOP/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education* by Clare Rose and Glenn F. Nyre, Evaluation and Training Institute, September 1976, pp. 97-107.

20/ See "An Evaluation of Selected Areas of EOP Student Achievement and Support Services," the California State University and Colleges, May 1978, p. 13.

21/ *Ibid*., pp. 143-144.

22/ Data for the University of California EOP program are not available beyond Fiscal Year 1975-76.

23/ Necessary data are not available to assess the degree of increase or decrease in the level of funding of the University of California's Educational Opportunity Program from 1975-76 to the present.

24/ See Table 4.

25/ See Table 5.

26/ An *Evaluation of Selected Areas of EOP Student Achievement and Support Services*, the California State University and Colleges, May 1978, p. i.

27/ *Ibid*., pp. 22-24.

28/ *Those Who Stay--Phase II: Student Continuance in the California State University and Colleges*, Technical Memorandum Number 8, the California State University and Colleges, May 1979.

29/ See *Access and Assistance: The Study of EOP/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education*, by Clare Rose and Glenn F. Nyre, Evaluation and Training Institute, September 1976.

30/ *Ibid*., p. 298.

31/ *Ibid*., p. 298.

32/ *Ibid*., pp. 303-304.

33/ "The University of California's Partnership Program--The First 18 Months," University of California Systemwide Administration, February 1978, p. 2.

34/ *Ibid*., p. 8.

35/ "CSUC Student Affirmative Action 1979-80 Program Change Proposal (Revised)," April 20, 1979, p. 4.

36/ *Ibid*., p. 4.

37/ "CSUC Student Affirmative Action 1979-80 Program Change Proposal (Revised)" dated April 20, 1979, p. 5.

38/ *Ibid*., p. 9.

39/ *Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics for Low-Achieving Students, 1977-78*, A report to the California Legislature as required by *Education Code* Section 58604, California State Board of Education, Sacramento, 1979, p. 2.

40/ *Ibid*., p. 3.

CHAPTER IV

"SPECIAL ACTION/EXCEPTION" ADMISSIONS POLICIES

The efforts to expand access to public postsecondary education for ethnic minorities have included the use of "special action" or "exception" admissions criteria by the University of California and the California State University and Colleges. This chapter (1) summarizes existing policy, (2) reviews the development of this policy during the past fifteen years, and (3) considers the implications of alternatives admissions criteria as a means of expanding educational opportunities for minority students.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Prior to 1962, the University used several plans for admitting first-time freshmen. The basic plan was a "B" average in ten high school academic subjects, distributed according to a required pattern. Alternate plans included being ranked in the highest 10 percent of the graduating class; 12 "A" or "B" grades in the last three years; or six "A" or "B" grades in the previous two years. 1/ In addition, students were admitted who did not qualify under any of these plans. Criteria for these special-action admissions "were based mostly on academic promise." 2/

The following is a description of procedures developed by the University in 1952 for reviewing candidates for admission by special action:

> Through these procedures students whose records show them to be ineligible may be considered for special action if brought to the attention of the Admissions Officer by a member of his staff, a faculty member, high school or junior college counselor, etc. The Admissions Officer, usually in consultation with a faculty committee, assesses the probable success of the student and makes a recommendation either affirmatively or negatively. The final decision is made by the Admissions Officer in conjunction with the Chancellor. 3/

During the decade preceding the Master Plan for Higher Education, special-action admissions accounted for 6.8 percent of the total freshmen admitted to the University between 1952 and 1956, and for 3.4 percent of those admitted in 1957 and 1958. To comply with the recommendations of the Master Plan, the University raised its regular admissions standards so that only the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates would be eligible for admission. In addition to this 12.5 percent, a 2 percent guideline was provided for exception and special admissions for both freshman and advanced standing applicants. Particular consideration for special admission was given to individuals with talents in athletics or the arts.

Prior to 1968, special admissions were not used as a means of expanding educational opportunities for ethnic minorities. In 1968, the 2 percent exception admissions ceiling was raised to 4 percent, with the additional 2 percent designated for freshman and advanced standing applicants with disadvantaged backgrounds. The increase for disadvantaged applicants would be limited in number (up to 2 percent of those regularly admitted) by the capacity of certain support programs such as financial aid, tutoring, special counseling, and other student services.

In practice, the University has admitted more than 2 percent of its freshmen as disadvantaged students. During the first three years of the program, Fall 1968 through Fall 1970, an average of 2.79 percent of the freshmen admitted were special-action/disadvantaged students. During the past five years, Fall 1973 through Fall 1977, the average was 3.68 percent. This admissions pattern is the result of anticipating some attrition during the freshman year and the desire to "surpass rather than fall below" the 2 percent admissions goal for disadvantaged students. 4/

In contrast to this pattern for freshman admissions, less than 2 percent of the University's advanced standing applicants were admitted through special action as disadvantaged students. During the first three years of the program, Fall 1968 through Fall 1970, an average of 1.58 percent of advanced standing applicants were admitted as special-action/disadvantaged students. During the past five years, Fall 1973 through Fall 1977, the average was 1.82 percent. The lower percentage at the advanced standing level "reflects the experience and judgment of the campuses that they are already admitting by Special Action all those advanced standing students who have a reasonable chance of success." 5/

There is general agreement among the University's campuses on the criteria used to identify disadvantaged students at both the freshmen and advanced levels. Particular consideration is given to historical parental income, parents' educational background, ethnic identity, bilingual background, and education in a high school which has not been traditionally a "feeder school" to the University.

While the criteria used to identify disadvantaged students are basically the same throughout the University system, there have been considerable differences among the campuses in the admission rate of special-action/disadvantaged students. During the past five years, the Riverside and San Diego campuses have admitted the largest proportion of such students at the freshman level, while the Los Angeles and Santa Barbara campuses have admitted the smallest proportion. The table below presents the average, by campus, during the past five years for special-action admissions of disadvantaged students as a percent of total freshman admissions.

TABLE IV-1

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SPECIAL ACTION ADMISSIONS OF DISADVANTAGED FRESHMAN STUDENTS, BY CAMPUS

Fall 1973 - Fall 1977

Riverside	5.91%
San Diego	5.17
Santa Cruz	4.90
Davis	4.10
Berkeley	3.92
Irvine	3.47
Santa Barbara	2.85
Los Angeles	2.03%

In January 1978, the Regents adopted new freshman admissions standards which the University anticipated might have an adverse impact on ethnic minority enrollments. To compensate for that possibility, the Regents also increased special-action admissions for disadvantaged freshman applicants from 2 to 4 percent. This new policy will be effective with admission to the fall term of 1979. No change was made in the size of the special-action admissions category for transfer students.

This liberalized policy is not expected to significantly increase the number of ethnic minority students attending the University. As explained by University staff, the "percentage figures should be viewed as goals or targets and not as rigid limits." 6/ Accordingly, it was decided that a range of from 3.5 percent to 4.5 percent for freshman special-action/disadvantaged admissions "would be considered reflective of Regental policy and intent." 7/ The percent of special-action/disadvantaged admissions was within this range in each of the four years from Fall 1974 through Fall 1977. (The actual number of students admitted through this program, however, was smaller in Fall 1977 than in Fall 1975.) If there is a general decrease in University enrollments for the next five years, as has been projected, a decrease in the number of disadvantaged students admitted through this program can also be anticipated. However, if the University's Partnership Program is successful, there should be an increase in about five years in the number of ethnic minorities who meet the regular admissions requirements.

The special admissions program has been effective in expanding opportunities for ethnic minorities to attend the University. Data on the admission and registration of special action and regularly admitted students for Fall 1977 indicate the following:

- Approximately 39 percent of all Black freshmen registered at the University were admitted as special-action/disadvantaged students. More than 45 percent were admitted under the special action categories as a whole.
- Approximately 32 percent of all Chicano freshmen registered at the University were admitted as special-action/disadvantaged students.
- Approximately 25 percent of all American-Indian freshmen registered at the University were admitted as special-action/disadvantaged students. More than 34 percent were admitted under special action categories as a whole.
- More than 41 percent of all special-action/disadvantaged students admitted to the University in Fall 1977 were Black. In contrast, only 28.2 percent of all such students were Chicano. (Among high school students in California, there are approximately twice as many Chicanos as Blacks.)

It is not clear how successful the University has been in retaining ethnic minorities after they gain admission. During the first nine years of the program, from Fall 1968 through Fall 1976, approximately 85 percent of the registered special-action/disadvantaged freshmen completed the Spring Quarter of the academic year, with a grade point average of approximately 2.31. (See appendix.) Data are not available concerning the graduation rate of students admitted by special action.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

The historical development of the "exception admissions" policy at the California State University and Colleges generally has been similar to that at the University of California. In 1960, the Master Plan established a 2 percent ceiling on exception admissions for both freshman and advanced standing applicants. This admissions category was used primarily for individuals with talents in athletics or the arts. In 1968, the category was expanded to 4 percent, with the additional 2 percent designated for "disadvantaged exceptions."

The State University's exception admission's program for disadvantaged students has been directly linked with its Educational Opportunity Program, which is designed to provide the special support services needed by these students. The "disadvantaged" student has been defined as one "who comes from a low-income family, who has the potential to perform satisfactorily on the college level, but who has been and appears to be unable to realize that potential without special assistance because of economic, cultural or educational background or environment." 9/

As initially implemented, the exception admissions program for disadvantaged students was computed to be 2 percent of anticipated freshman admissions plus 2 percent of anticipated transfer applications. In practice, a much higher percentage of new freshman enrollees were admitted under disadvantaged exception category, because the number admitted was based upon a projection of the number expected to be admitted under regular criteria. In 1976-77, for example, 8.1 percent of the new lower division enrollees was admitted under the disadvantaged exception admissions category.

During the past two years, a new formula has been implemented which eliminates the reliance upon projected admissions and applications. The formula now used for both general and disadvantaged exception admissions is 4 percent of all new undergraduate enrollees during the previous year minus the number of exceptions admitted the previous year. The general exceptions can be used to admit disadvantaged students but the disadvantaged exceptions cannot be used to admit general exceptions. 10/ In Fall 1978, 76 percent of all freshmen admitted by exception were disadvantaged.

Data for the admission of special action and regular admits between Fall 1970 to Fall 1978 indicate the following:

- The number and percentage of special action/disadvantaged freshman, non-disadvantaged freshman, and non-disadvantaged transfer students increased steadily between 1970 and 1978. Conversely, the number and percentage of special action/disadvantaged transfer students decreased from 4.1 percent (1,415) in 1970 to 1.9 percent (844) in 1978.

- The special action/disadvantaged freshman and transfer students had higher continuation rates (from the fall to the spring term of the first year) than did the non-disadvantaged freshman and transfer students admitted in Fall 1976, Fall 1977, and Fall 1978.

- Fall 1978 data indicate that the entering grade point average for special action/disadvantaged transfer students averaged 2.40, while that of non-disadvantaged transfer students averaged 2.66. At the end of their first term, special action/disadvantaged students had an average grade point average of 2.19 compared to that of 2.43 for the non-disadvantaged group, and 2.72 for all first-time undergraduate transfer students.

- Fall 1978 data also indicate the average grade point average for special action/disadvantaged students at the end of the first term was 2.18, compared to 2.26 for non-disadvantaged/students admitted by exception, and to 2.57 for all first-time freshmen.

As discussed in a previous chapter, almost all disadvantaged students enrolling in the State University under the exception admissions category are participants in the Educational Opportunity Program and therefore receive the support services provided by this program. The discussion of the implications of these alternative admissions criteria as a means of expanding educational opportunities for minority students therefore was provided in that chapter. It does not appear likely that the proportionate size of the State University's exception admissions program will be expanded in the near future, given the conclusion that "there does . . . seem to be agreement that for several reasons relatively little additional student affirmative action progress is likely to be achieved through expanded exception admissions. If there are to be more disadvantaged students admitted by exception, provision for them probably should be made within existing total allocations." 11/

It is not anticipated that there will be a significant increase during the next decade in the numbers of ethnic minority students admitted to the State University under the exception admissions category. Since the number of students admitted under this category each year is predicated on the number of new enrollees admitted by regular admission the previous year, and since a general enrollment decline is expected in the State University system during the coming decade, the number of minorities admitted under the category will also decline.

CONCLUSIONS: Implications of the Special Admissions Programs

While most of the minority students enrolled in California's four-year public institutions were not admitted by special action or exception, these programs have had a major impact in increasing minority enrollments. For example, in the University of California in Fall 1977, approximately 39 percent of all Black freshmen and 32 percent of all Chicano freshmen registered were admitted as special-action/disadvantaged students. During the past ten years the expansion of these programs has been responsible for the admission of increasingly larger numbers of minority students. However, the number of admissions by exception can be expected to decrease annually during the next decade as the general enrollment within the University and the State University decreases, since the number of students admitted annually under the exception admissions category is tied directly to annual enrollments or applications received for all students. Accordingly, the special admissions program for disadvantaged students will play a decreasing role in the statewide effort to expand educational opportunities for ethnic minorities.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Selection and Retention of Students in California's Institutions of Higher Education, California Department of Education, 1961.

2. UC Regents' Agenda, January 19, 1978, Item 302, Committee on Educational Policy, p. 3.

3. Op. Cit., California Department of Education, 1961.

4. U.C. Regents' Agenda, January 19, 1978, p. 2.

5. Ibid., p. 2.

6. Ibid., p. 2.

7. Ibid., p. 2.

8. See the "Report on Admissions by Special Action for Fall Quarter, 1977," UC Regents' Agenda, January 10, 1979, Item 302, Committee on Educational Policy.

9. "Summary of Admissions Policies of the Trustees of the CSUC," January 20, 1978, p. 3, as quoted from Title 5 of the California Administrative Code.

10. See Ibid, p. 3, as well as the "Minutes of the Meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission Intersegmental Task Force on Admissions and Articulation," January 30, 1979, pp. 8-9.

11. "Report on CSUC Admissions Exceptions Policies," to the Committee on Educational Policy, CSUC Board of Trustees, Agenda Item 1, March 28-29, 1978.

CHAPTER V

INTERSEGMENTAL CONSORTIA DESIGNED TO INCREASE THE ENROLLMENT OF ETHNIC MINORITIES, WOMEN, AND LOW-INCOME STUDENTS

A previous Commission report on equal educational opportunity concluded that "we have reached a point that little more of real significance can be done to improve quality of educational opportunity except through cooperative effort." 1/ This chapter identifies and examines the extent to which postsecondary institutions are working toward more equitable representation of minority and low-income students in postsecondary education through formal collaborative efforts among institutions and segments. Eleven intersegmental consortia 2/ which share this objective have been identified through a thorough review of student affirmative action plans, reports and inventories; communications with segmental offices; and a telephone survey of a sample of college campuses in several regions of the State. A questionnaire was sent to each of the consortia in the Spring of 1978 to determine the nature and extent of their activities. The results of the survey provide the basis for the description and analysis which follows.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Table V-1 lists the eleven consortia, their participating institutions, and the geographical area served by each. As indicated, all of the consortia address access and retention for low-income and ethnic minority students at the undergraduate level, while three also address underrepresentation at the graduate and professional level. The undergraduate-level projects may be further classified into programs designed to (1) increase representation of target clientele in all segments of postsecondary education, and (2) increase representation of the target clientele at a particular campus.

Each consortium has been set up to address some of the problems identified with the single-campus or single-visit approach to reaching ethnic minority and low-income students. Respondents to the Commission's survey have indicated the following shortcomings of this approach: (1) it lacks effectiveness in reaching students outside the college preparatory mainstream; (2) it duplicates services; (3) it promotes competition for students; (4) it limits communication between campuses and segments; (5) it provides little or no assistance to rejected applicants; and (6) it lacks a system of accountability for identifying and/or meeting regional population needs.

TABLE V-1

LISTING OF STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CONSORTIA
1978 - 1979

Groups by Primary Program Purpose	Participating Campuses	Geographic Region
INFORMATION ABOUT EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL		
1. Central Coast Consortium	University of Santa Clara UC Santa Cruz CSU San Jose CSU Hayward Cabrillo College Chabot College De Anza College Evergreen College Foothill College Gavilan College Hartnell College Mission College Monterey Peninsula College Ohlone College San Jose City College	Central Coast
2. Sacramento Consortium for Equal Educational Opportunity	UC Davis CSU Sacramento American River College Sacramento City College Grant Unified High School Dist.	Sacramento Area
3. San Diego EOP/S Consortium	UC San Diego CSU San Diego Mesa Community College Miramar Community College San Diego City College Southwestern Community College San Diego Unified School Dist. Sweetwater Unified School Dist.	San Diego Area
4. American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association	*All UC Campuses	Statewide
5. Raza Administrators and Counselors in Higher Education (RACHE)	All UC Campuses All CSUC Campuses Community Colleges Independent Colleges Community Agencies	Statewide Program with regional Coordination: Northern, Central and Southern
6. South Coast EOP/S Consortium	UC Irvine CSPU Pomona CSU Dominguez Hills CSU Fullerton CSU Long Beach Cerritos College Chapman College Compton College Cypress College Fullerton College Golden West College Long Beach City College Los Angeles Harbor College Orange Coast College Rio Hondo College Saddleback College Santa Ana College Pacific Oaks College (Associate Member)	South Coast Region

---

*While formal participation to date includes only UC campuses, other postsecondary campuses participate in this organization's activities. However, the relationship remains an informal one.

TABLE V-1

LISTING OF STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CONSORTIA
1978 - 1979

Continued

Groups by Primary Program Purpose	Participating Campuses	Geographic Region
CAMPUS RECRUITMENT		
1. Community College Consortium (UC Berkeley)	UC Berkeley Alameda College Contra Costa College Laney College Merritt College Los Medranos College Solano College San Francisco City College	San Francisco Bay
2. Community College and High School Consortium (UCLA)	UCLA Compton College East Los Angeles College Los Angeles City College Pasadena City College Crenshaw High School Garfield High School Lincoln High School Los Angeles High School Manual Arts High School Roosevelt High School Van Ness High School Wilson High School	Los Angeles Area
GRADUATE/PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL OUTREACH		
1. Western Name Exchange	All UC Graduate/Professional Schools Arizona State University Claremont Graduate School New Mexico State University Oregon State University Rice University San Jose State University Stanford University University of Arizona University of Colorado University of Kansas University of New Mexico University of Oregon University of Texas @ El Paso University of Utah University of Washington University of Houston	Western States
2. The Name Exchange	University of Wisconsin Columbia University Cornell University Brown University Yale University University of Pennsylvania Northwestern University University of Washington University of California Berkeley University of Minnesota Washington University Princeton University Massachusetts Institute of Technology University of Michigan	Nationwide
3. Coordinating Committee on Graduate and Professional Advancement (CCCPA)	All UC Graduate and Professional Schools Stanford University	Statewide

#53-mj/137b

While four of the consortia are still in the planning stage, seven have begun to respond to some of the shortcomings identified above. Their responses, by and large, represent the activities in which the consortia have been involved. Intensive follow-up activities using (peer) role models is the approach used to improve effectiveness in reaching minority and low-income students. Outreach visits to local high schools are coordinated to decrease duplication of services. Outreach staff are trained to provide general information about all of the public segments in order to encourage cooperation, rather than competition, in recruiting students. Regularly scheduled meetings to share ideas and program concepts and design provide an avenue for communication among campuses. A few groups have designed a formal referral system to assist ineligible applicants in gaining admission to another postsecondary institution. None of the consortia, however, has a systematic method for identifying and meeting the postsecondary educational needs of the population within its region.

There is basic agreement among the consortia on the premises which form the rationale for the services provided to their clientele.

- Minority and low-income students are generally outside the mainstream of college-awareness programs;
- Students outside the mainstream frequently are not encouraged, and are sometimes even discouraged, from applying for college admission;
- Students outside the mainstream receive little or no information, and sometimes are misinformed, about postsecondary educational opportunities; and
- A significant percentage of students outside the mainstream are eligible for regular or special admission to colleges and universities and qualify for various financial aid programs.

CURRENT STATUS OF INTERSEGMENTAL COOPERATION

Nearly all of the intersegmental consortia for undergraduate student affirmative action grew out of a similar need--to address the substantial confusion and inefficiences created by the proliferation of outreach programs for underrepresented groups.

Three of the undergraduate-level intersegmental efforts (Central Coast Consortium, Sacramento Consortium for Equal Educational Opportunity, and San Diego Consortium) are in the first year of operation and have a tentative organizational structure. (See Table V-2, which outlines the development stages undergone by each consortium.) Most of the activity during this initial year has been

TABLE V-2

STATUS OF STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CONSORTIA
1978 - 1979

		STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT			
		Planning →	Implementation →	Operational →	Institutionalized
Student Affirmative Action Groups By Primary Program Purpose	Year of Operation	.Initiate meetings .Define the challenge .Set goals and objectives .Determine priorities .Establish timeline .Identify potential funding sources	.Gain program support .Actively seek funding .Begin implementation	.Formal structure in place .Systemwide recognition .All or most activities well underway	.Sponsoring campus(es) Provide total program support.
Information About Education Beyond High School					
1. Central Coast Consortium	1	→ *			
2. Sacramento Consortium for Equal Educational Opportunity	1	→ *			
3. San Diego Consortium	1	→ *			
4. American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association	3	→	→	→ *	
5. Raza Administrators and Counselors in Higher Education	3	→	→	→ *	
6. South Coast EOP/S Consortium	3	→	→	→ *	
Campus Recruitment					
1. Community College Consortium (UC Berkeley)	2	→	→	→	→ *
2. Community College and High School Consortium (UCLA)	8	→	→	→	→ *
Graduate/Professional School Outreach					
1. Western Name Exchange	1	→ *			
2. The Name Exchange	2	→	→	→ *	
3. Coordinating Committee on Graduate and Professional Advancement	5	→	→	→ *	

directed toward establishing goals and objectives, initiating meetings, and identifying potential funding sources.

Projects which have been functioning for a longer time are somewhat more structured. The South Coast EOP/S Consortium, for example, has a set of by-laws that establish the name, purpose, objectives, membership, leadership, and rules of governance of the organization. Similarly, the Coordinating Committee for Graduate and Professional Advancement, American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association, and the Raza Administrators and Counselors in Higher Education have established a formal structure, defined goals and objectives, established leadership roles, and adopted rules of governance.

Two of the programs at the University of California center around the activities of the Undergraduate Admissions Office and/or Office of Relations with Schools. The Los Angeles campus sponsors the Community College Consortium Project, and the Berkeley campus sponsors the Student Affirmative Action Consortium Project. Thus, these two programs are guided by the program planning and policies established by the Undergraduate Admissions Office and/or the campus Office of Relations with Schools, with advice from appropriate personnel at the participating campuses.

In contrast to the majority of undergraduate consortia, the graduate student affirmative action groups and the American Indian Counselor/Recruiters Association grew out of a need to establish outreach efforts (rather than out of a need to coordinate existing programs) to seek out and assist minority graduate and American Indian undergraduate students to continue their education. This pattern is most likely due to the smaller size of the target group.

Table V-3 indicates the number of students served by the consortia that have been active for a year or longer. It should be noted that the percentages of low-income, ethnic minority, and women students are only approximations. Comprehensive data by income, ethnicity, and sex have not been collected and/or compiled by any of the groups.

While few conclusions can be drawn from the data available, it is clear that each undergraduate program has shown a progressive increase in the number of students served. These figures clearly indicate the potential utility of intersegmental cooperation in reaching students from underrepresented groups. The consensus among the consortia is that the strengthening of the organization over time and the increase in campus participation account for their growth.

Table V-4 indicates the program costs, funding sources, cost to students served, and cost to participating campuses during the 1978-79 fiscal year. The University of California's two campus-oriented programs are supported directly by institutional funds. Currently,

TABLE V-3

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED BY STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CONSORTIA

PROGRAM PURPOSE	# PARTICIPANTS					% LOW INCOME					% ETHNIC MINORITY					% WOMEN				
Name of Group	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79[1]	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79[1]	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79[1]	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79[1]
OUTREACH: CAMPUS																				
1. Community College and High School Consortium	2,000	3,000	4,000	5,000	6,000	75	75	75	75	75	80	80	80	80	80	30	35	35	40	40
2. Student Affirmative Community College Consortium			35	75	100			85	85	85			75	75	75			15	20	30
OUTREACH: POSTSECONDARY EDU.																				
3. American Indian Counselors/ Recruiters Association				1,366	1,700				100	100				90	90				40	50
4. South Coast EOP/S Consortium			500	2,000	2/			70	70	70			80	80	80			50	50	50+
5. Raza Administrators and Counselors in Higher Edu.			2,220	3,800	10,000			85+	85+	85+				80	80				45	50
TOTAL (UNDERGRADUATE)	2,000	3,000	6,755	12,241	17,800															
OUTREACH: GRADUATE EDU.																				
6 Coordinating Committee on Graduate & Professional Advancement			3/																	
7. Committee on Cooperative Minority Student Recruitment				1,700	2/				4/					100	100				50	50
TOTAL (GRADUATE)			2/																	

1/ 1978-79 are estimated figures, dependent on funding and program support.

2/ Unable to determine.

3/ Data collected by campus; to date information has not been compiled.

4/ Data not collected.

TABLE V-4

FUNDING OF STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION CONSORTIA

Name of Program	Program Cost 1977-78	(%) Source of Funding	Cost to Student	Annual Cost to Institution
1. Community College and High School Consortium	$70,000 Community College Project 15,000 High School Project $85,000 TOTAL	(100%) UCLA General Fund 1/	0	Office Space (In Kind)
2. Student Affirmative Action Comm. College Consortium	$ 4,000 20% Asst. Dir. Salary 3,000 100% Peer Recruiters 2,000 25% Clerical Support Salary $ 9,000 TOTAL	(100%) UC Berkeley General Fund	0	Office Space (In Kind)
3. American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association	$10,000 College Motivation Day 5,000 Media 3,000 Correspondence $18,000 TOTAL	(100%) UC Systemwide Outreach Services	0	Approx. $1000 (In Kind)
4. Central Coast Consortium	2/	2/	0	2/
5. Sacramento Regional EEO Program	2/	2/	0	2/
			0	
6. South Coast EOP/S Consortium	3/	(100%) Campus EOP and EOP/S Funding	0	$25.00 Dues
7. Raza Administrators and Counselors in Higher Education	$1,500 - $3,000/College Information Day	(50%) Sponsoring Institution (50%) UC Systemwide Outreach Services	0	$750-$1,500
8. San Diego Consortium	2/	2/	0	2/
9. Coordinating Committee on Graduate/Prof. Advancement	4/	4/	0	4/
10. Committee on Cooperative Minority Student Recruitment (The Name Exchange)	$200 Annual Meeting	(100%) Participating Institutions	0	Varies by Institution
11. Western Name Exchange	2/	2/	0	2/

1/ Between 1971-75 the program received federal TRIO Special Services funds.

2/ Initial year; planning and development costs undetermined.

3/ Program cost has not been determined.

4/ No response; however CCGPA did indicate that UC Outreach Services will finance CCGPA brochure and a central office coordinator.

only one University-wide consortium (the American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association) receives all of its support from the Office of Outreach Services. The same office has provided financial support for the Raza Administrators and Counselors in Higher Education in sponsoring the "College Information Days." None of the programs has resulted in any cost to students, and the contributions by the campus administration have largely been "in kind" rather than in direct financial support.

PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED

Each intersegmental consortium has had to cope with the same general problems. Of particular importance are the difficulties of establishing cooperative programs that involve bringing institutions together and/or of providing financial or administrative support. While each consortium has responded in basically the same manner, none of the problems has been completely resolved.

Resistance to change has been encountered at both the postsecondary and high school levels. At the Community College level, the resistance has been based partially on a distrust of the motives of the four-year segments. In consortia involving EOP and EOPS programs, for example, EOPS Directors have voiced concern that four-year campuses would use the consortium to recruit EOPS students to transfer to a four-year institution. Although the issue has not been resolved completely, each consortium is striving to build mutual trust and reciprocity through open meetings to establish objectives that reflect the needs of each segment and the respective target groups.

The high schools and Community Colleges participating in the University's campus-based consortia at Los Angeles and Berkeley resisted outreach programs in which paraprofessional counselors would provide follow-up assistance to prospective students. The reason was the fear that they would have to afford other colleges the same opportunity to place outreach counselors on the campus. Apparently, the problem has not been completely resolved since high school and Community College counselors typically complain about "too many recruiters." While the campus-based programs are not in a good position to resolve the fundamental problem of duplication, the South Coast EOP/S intersegmental consortium has discussed training paraprofessionals to provide information on all segments of postsecondary education. This might be an approach to which counselors would not object.

Individual institutional effort, rather than cooperation, has been a typical pattern during the past ten years in the efforts to recruit ethnic minorities and low-income students. As a result, the issue of program control is a second major problem. The consortia have attempted to respond to this issue by establishing a formal structure, rotating host campuses for meetings, involving different campuses on the agenda, and ensuring that each segment was represented on executive committees.

The third major problem has been the lack of financial and administrative support for these intersegmental efforts. It should be noted that each of these efforts was initiated at a program level and that there is a substantial amount of time, cost, and effort involved in implementing it. While Assembly Bill 507 (Fazio) may have been the catalyst for the formation of some of the newer groups, there have been no financial incentives for programs and institutions to work with one another toward cutting costly duplication and competition. Again, this problem has not been resolved completely. Most of the organizations for undergraduate student affirmative action prepared proposals for funding through AB 507. Others have been successful in receiving EOP/S or UC Student Affirmative Action funding. Another type of support found lacking has been at the administrative level. Rather than directly participating in the organization, program directors have frequently sent their assistants.

CURRENT AND FUTURE PLANS

The current plans of the three newest consortia (the Central Coast Consortium, the Sacramento Consortium for Equal Educational Opportunity, and the San Diego Consortium) include implementation of ideas, formalization of the organization, and the development of program proposals. Future plans naturally are dependent upon the success of current efforts. Critical factors affecting these efforts will be group initiative and financial and administrative program support.

Both the Raza Administrators and Counselors on Higher Education (RACHE) and the Los Angeles-campus program plan to do more of the same. RACHE plans to conduct additional College Information Days to reach more students throughout the State, and the campus program plans to include parochial schools in order to reach more students within the region. Both programs feel the critical factor will be funding.

Both the Coordinating Committee on Graduate and Professional Advancement (CCGPA) and the American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association plan to seek support for a systemwide staff position to coordinate their activities. The CCGPA also plans to refine recruitment visits and reach 1,000 more students than in the previous year. The American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association plans to sponsor College Motivation Days at each University campus and at four reservation areas and to involve the State University and the Community Colleges more actively in its activities. Both groups indicated funding would be a major factor in the future of their efforts. The CCGPA also listed the implementation of the Bakke decision as having an impact on their College Information Days. Members fear that, if attention is not focused on minority students the latter group may not benefit as much as the CCGPA would hope.

The South Coast EOP/S Consortium also has ambitious plans. These include: (1) creation of a sophisticated data base for the South Coast region reflecting targeted groups presently enrolled by high schools, Community Colleges, the State University, and the University of California, Irvine; (2) expansion of the combined visitation program; (3) and the development of a proposal to provide peer counselors to Community College students, develop an effective outreach newsletter, and establish a summer residence program for targeted groups. The factors that would prevent this expansion would be a lack of campus-level administrative or financial support.

THE COMMISSION'S ROLE AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING REGIONAL COORDINATION

One final question asked of the intersegmental consortia was related to the Commission's role in promoting regional coordination and cooperation in expanding educational opportunities for ethnic minority and low-income students. Three suggestions were made by more than one group:

- Provide assistance in setting up evaluation mechanisms and conduct external evaluations;

- Disseminate information about funding sources, developmental progress being made in other regions, pertinent legislation, etc.; and

- Provide moral support and encouragement to groups.

There was considerable variation in the other suggestions offered:

- Develop models of successful programs for others to follow;

- Encourage other regions to make better use of resources by working together toward student affirmative action goals;

- Convene mini-conferences to bring consortia together to share ideas, materials, etc.; and

- Provide technical assistance in writing proposals for funding.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

During the past two years, a number of promising intersegmental student affirmative action efforts have occurred, which suggest a fertile area for further development. The systemwide offices of the public segments have provided the following list to illustrate these recent cooperative efforts:

- the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (CAL-SOAP);
- the preparation and cooperative efforts to implement the recommendations of an intersegmental report on Increasing the Rate and Retention of Community College Transfers from Underrepresented Groups, in response to language in the 1978-79 Budget report;
- a joint conference of State University and University faculty and staff concerning "University Responses to Students of the 80s";
- six regional intersegmental advisory committees, with supporting intersegmental outreach efforts, convened by the State University as a part of each of its model projects in student affirmative action. (Several of these committees involve all of the public segments.);
- the California Writing Project; and
- strengthening of the emphasis on minority and low-income outreach in the Joint California College and University Day (CCUD), through direct involvement of segmental student affirmative action staff.

These examples show the potential of intersegmental cooperation, both present and future, and illustrate the possible range of cooperative activities. While the primary emphasis of this chapter has been placed upon formal coordinative efforts, this is not intended to preclude other forms of cooperation such as those listed above. Communication and cooperation among the postsecondary segments must continue as an ongoing and developing process.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data and analysis provided in this chapter, the following conclusions are offered:

1. Current budgetary approaches promote independent outreach and recruitment efforts by individual postsecondary institutions for ethnic minority and low-income students, rather than cooperative, coordinated efforts by institutions within the same geographical region.

2. Existing intersegmental programs are generally the result of the initiative, imagination, and energy of program personnel who are committed to cooperative efforts with their colleagues at other institutions.

3. The Legislature has not specified that the University of California use State funds for its systemwide student affirmative action program in order to initiate and stimulate intersegmental cooperative efforts, and, generally, the University has not used the funds for this purpose. During the past year, however, the central administration has provided some financial support for two of the established intersegmental efforts--American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association and Raza Administrators and Counselors in Higher Education.

4. The most substantial financial commitment by the State to student affirmative action has been in the Community Colleges' EOPS program and the State University's EOP program. Thus far, and despite the similarity of objectives, these programs have not worked as closely together as desirable in developing cooperative, intersegmental efforts. The major exception to this generalization is the South Coast EOPS Consortium.

5. The three intersegmental consortia which are operational and which are designed to provide information to high school students about postsecondary alternatives have apparently been successful in (1) reaching students outside the college preparatory mainstream, (2) improving communication among the campuses in the region, (3) reducing undesirable duplication of services and competition for students, and (4) providing assistance to applicants ineligible for admission.

FOOTNOTES

1/ Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part I, California Postsecondary Education Commission, April 1976, p. 21.

2/ For purposes of discussion, an intersegmental consortium involves two or more postsecondary institutions in a formal structure for cooperation, including periodic meeting dates, agreed upon goals and objectives, program priorities, and a formalized decision-making process.

CHAPTER VI

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Federal, State, and institutional student assistance programs have provided a means for low- and middle-income students to pay for a large portion of the costs of a college education. These programs have thereby facilitated the enrollment and retention of ethnic minorities.

This chapter: (1) identifies the student assistance programs which relate directly to student affirmative action, (2) describes the ethnic and sex composition of student aid recipients, (3) assesses the importance of student financial assistance to student affirmative action, and (4) identifies problems to be resolved if the benefits of these programs are to be expanded. For purposes of discussion, a student financial assistance program is considered to be part of the student affirmative action effort if its explicit or primary purpose is to provide aid to ethnic minority, women, and/or low-income students.

FEDERALLY FUNDED STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The federal government provides extensive funding for several student assistance programs which relate directly to the goals and purposes of student affirmative action. These programs include:

- Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program (BEOG): This program, which provides the foundation for all other federal and State student assistance programs, offers grants of up to $1,800 to eligible low- and middle-income undergraduates who are enrolled at least half time. The primary purpose of the BEOG program is to maximize postsecondary options for low- and middle-income students. Funding for this program has increased dramatically during the past five years, with approximately $2.6 billion allocated nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program (SEOG): This program provides funds to "exceptionally needy" undergraduate and vocational students who are enrolled at least half time. SEOG grants are intended to supplement BEOG funds, with students eligible to receive between $200 and $1,500 per year, up to a maximum of $4,000 for four years of study. Federal funding for the SEOG program was approximately $340 million nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- National Direct Student Loan Program (NDSL): This program provides direct loans to financially needy students attending eligible postsecondary institutions. Loans of up to $2,500 are available to students who have completed less than two years of an undergraduate program, and up to $5,000 for students who have completed at least two years, with an aggregate loan not to exceed $10,000. These loans can also be used for graduate study. The federal government contributes 90 percent of the principal necessary to establish a revolving loan fund at each participating institution, with the institutions contributing the remaining 10 percent. Students are expected to begin repayment of the loans nine months after completing their undergraduate studies (or when they discontinue their educational program). Approximately $310 million was appropriated nationally for this program in Fiscal Year 1979.

- College Work-Study Program (CWS): This program is a cost-shared program of federal and institutional support (80-20) for the part-time employment, both on and off campus, of undergraduate and graduate students attending eligible institutions. CWS funds are allocated directly to the institution, with each deciding how to distribute the monies among the students with greatest financial need. Federal funding for the CWS program has increased significantly during the past four years, with approximately $550 million appropriated nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- State Student Incentive Grant Program (SSIG): This program provides matching federal grants to encourage states to establish or expand their own assistance programs for "substantially needy" undergraduate students attending eligible postsecondary institutions. Low- and middle-income students are eligible to receive grants of up to $1,500 a year, half of which is provided by the state. During the past five years, federal funding for this program has increased by more than 300 percent, with approximately $76 million appropriated nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- Nursing Scholarship Program: This program provides funding to accredited nursing schools to assist students of "exceptional financial need" to enroll in courses of study leading to a career in nursing. Students selected by the institution may receive up to $2,000 per academic year. Federal funding for this program was approximately $9 million nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- Indian Higher Education Grants Program (Bureau of Indian Affairs): This program is designed to encourage American-Indian students to continue education beyond high school, with grant funds provided for tuition and fees, textbooks, and related undergraduate educational expenses. Approximately $34 million in federal funds was appropriated nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program: This program provides grants to ethnic minorities and women for study in academic and professional areas in which they are underrepresented. Funds are also provided to colleges to strengthen and develop recruitment and retention programs to assist in providing graduate and professional education to such underrepresented groups. 1/ Approximately $8 million was appropriated nationally for this program in Fiscal Year 1979.

- Legal Training for the Disadvantaged: This program provides funding for the Council on Legal Education Opportunity (CLEO), which was established to increase the number of lawyers from ethnic minority and/or low-income backgrounds. Participants in the program attend an intensive six- to eight-week summer prelaw preparation program, receive $1,000 fellowships during each academic year of law school, and have tuition and fees waived. Federal funding for this program was approximately $1 million nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- Fellowships for Indian Students: This program, also known as "Section 423 Fellowships," is intended to "enable American Indian students to pursue courses of study that are at least three years, but not more than four academic years, and provide a professional or graduate degree in engineering, medicine, law, business, forestry, or a field related to one of these areas. Fellowships include individual stipends, dependency allowances, tuition and fees, book allowances, and, in some cases, research expenses." 2/ Federal funding for this program was approximately $1.5 million nationally in Fiscal Year 1979.

- Scholarships for First-Year Students of Exceptional Financial Need (EFN Scholarships): This program provides funds to schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, podiatry, and pharmacy for scholarships to full-time, first-year students with exceptional financial need. In Fiscal Year 1979, approximately $7 million was appropriated nationally for this program.

STATE-FUNDED STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

California maintains several student financial assistance programs intended to supplement and complement the federal programs described above. The five State programs which relate directly to the goals of student affirmative action are:

- Cal Grant A Program (State Scholarships): This program assists academically able, financially needy students to pursue programs of study at California postsecondary institutions of their choice. Scholarship awards are for student tuition and fees, with the maximum annual award currently $2,900. Each recipient is eligible to renew the award, not to exceed a maximum of four years. State funding for this program was approximately $51 million in Fiscal Year 1979-80.

- Cal Grant B Program (College Opportunity Grants): This program is designed to meet the needs of low-income, disadvantaged students who have demonstrated a potential for success in college. Grants to students include support for annual living expenses up to $1,100, as well as tuition and fees. While the average grant in 1977-78 was $1,074, the maximum award possible is $3,600. State funding for this program was approximately $17 million in Fiscal Year 1979-80.

- Cal Grant C Program (Occupational Education and Training Grants): This program is designed to provide financial assistance to needy and talented students enrolled in postsecondary occupational programs, primarily in private vocational institutions and Community Colleges. Maximum annual awards are $2,000 for tuition and fees and $500 for books, supplies, and related training materials. State funding for this program was approximately $3 million in Fiscal Year 1979-80.

- Graduate Fellowship Program: The general purpose of this program is to provide opportunity for graduate study to unusually able individuals who might otherwise, because of financial, home and/or community environmental conditions, be unable to enroll. The average annual grant in 1977-78 was $2,293. State funding for this program was approximately $2.8 million in Fiscal Year 1979-80.

- Bilingual Teacher Development Grant Program: This program provides grants to individuals with financial need who are likely to qualify for a bilingual certificate of competence within two years. Grants may be used to cover tuition, fees, and subsistence expenses, but may not exceed $3,000 per academic year. State funding for this program was approximately $364,000 in Fiscal Year 1979-80.

These sixteen programs, funded by federal and State government, provided more than $250 million in financial assistance for low-income students attending California postsecondary institutions in 1978. (See Table VI-1.) The vast majority of these funds are targeted for undergraduate students; less than 2 percent is designated for graduate students. The priority for both federal and State student

TABLE VI-1

FUNDING FOR STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA 1977-1978 ($000's)

Name of Program	Funding for Undergraduate Education	Funding for Graduate Education	Funding for Either Undergraduate or Graduate
Federal Programs:			
Basic Education Opportunity Grant (BEOG)	$127,642		
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG)	$ 27,516		
National Direct Student Loans (NDSL)			$33,524
College Work-Study (CWS)			$33,777
State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG)	$ 10,010		
Nursing Scholarship Program	$ 578		
Indian Higher Education Grants Program (Bureau of Indian Affairs)	$ 850		
Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program		$ 137	
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged	NA		
Fellowship for Indian Students			
Scholarships for First-Year Students of Exceptional Financial Need		$ 411	
Total Federal Funding	$166,596	$ 548	$67,301
State Programs:			
Cal Grant A	$ 47,580		
Cal Grant B	$ 14,190		
Cal Grant C	$ 2,352		
Graduate Fellowship Program		$ 2,520	
Bilingual Teacher Development Grant Program			$ 342
Total State Funding	$ 64,122	$ 2,520	$ 342
Institutional Programs:			
University of California			
Scholarships	$ 2,702	$ 6,642	
Grants	$ 13,037	$10,282	
Loans	$ 2,384	$ 3,353	
Work-Study	$ 1,043	$ 863	
California State University and Colleges			
Fee Wavier	$ 170		
College Work-Study			$ 1,143
California Community Colleges	$ 15,330		
Hastings College of Law		$ 75	
California Independent Colleges			$41,300
Total Institutional Funding	$ 34,666	$21,215	$42,443
Total All Funding	$230,718	$ 3,068	$67,643

NOTE: The Educational Opportunity Program (which includes a financial assistance component) is discussed in a previous chapter, and therefore not included in this table for the State University and the Community Colleges.

TABLE VI-2

SOURCES OF STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS
1978-1979

	State	Federal	Institutional	Other	Total Amount of Financial Assistance Funds
University of California	10.7%	47.5%	30.1%	11.6%	$121,359,000
California State University and Colleges	29.3	57.8	0.4	11.5	93,368,000
California Community Colleges	19.9	73.1	7.1	-	117,396,000
Hastings College of Law	17.6	70.7	1.9	9.8	3,309,000
California Independent Colleges	38.8	29.6	31.6	-	138,745,000
					$474,177,000

Source: Governor's Budget, 1979-80, page 1055-1056, Higher Education Student Assistance Table.

TABLE VI-3

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SUMMARY OF SOURCES AND AMOUNT OF STUDENT AID FUNDS
1975-76 AND 1977-78

	Amount of Aid (Figures in Thousands)						Percent Change		
	1975-76			1977-78			1975-76 to 1977-78		
Source	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total
State of California	$ 7,992	$ 307	$ 8,299	$10,326	$ 460	$ 10,786	+29.2%	+49.8%	+30.0%
University of California	19,875	18,640	38,515	19,166	21,140	40,306	-3.6	+13.4	+4.7
Federal Government	24,093	17,930	42,023	32,771	19,341	52,112	+36.0	+7.9	+24.0
Private and Outside Agencies	7,931	7,968	15,899	5,752	8,640	14,392	-27.5	+8.4	-9.5
Total	$59,891	$44,845	$104,736	$68,015	$49,581	$117,596	+13.6%	+10.6%	+12.3%

Source: Report on Student Aid 1977-78, to Members of the Committee on Educational Policy, Office of the President, University of California, March 7, 1979, page 2.

aid has been undergraduate instruction, with minimal funding provided for student assistance beyond the baccalaureate level.

INSTITUTIONALLY FUNDED STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

California's postsecondary institutions, particularly the University of California and the independent colleges and universities, provide substantial funding for student assistance programs designed to supplement and complement federal and State programs. These institutionally funded programs include grants, loans, fee waivers, and college work-study and other part-time, on-campus employment.

Approximately 30 percent of the financial assistance received by students attending the University and the independent colleges is provided through institutional resources. This funding source is particularly important at the graduate level, where governmental student assistance has been more limited. At the University, for example, approximately 43 percent of the financial assistance received by graduate students is provided from institutional resources. During the three-year period from 1975-76 to 1977-78, institutional funds for graduate students at the University increased by more than 13 percent. The State University and the Community Colleges derive only a small proportion of their student financial assistance from institutional funds.

ETHNIC, SEX, AND INCOME COMPOSITION OF STUDENT AID RECIPIENTS

Available data concerning the ethnic composition of student aid recipients indicate that ethnic minorities have been major participants in almost all of the programs described above. (See Table VI-4.) Of particular importance are three State-funded programs; Cal Grant B, the Community College EOPS (financial aid component), and the State University EOP (financial aid components) account for more than 75 percent of the aid recipients from a minority background. Chicano students have the largest representation among Cal Grant B recipients, while Black students are the largest group among State University EOP financial aid recipients. (See Table VI-6.) The State-funded Graduate Fellowship Program also has a high rate of participation by minority students, with ethnic minorities receiving approximately half of the awards in 1977-78. (See Table VI-7.) While data are not available concerning the ethnic composition of BEOG recipients, ethnic minorities comprise slightly less than half of the recipients of the three major federally funded, institutionally based student assistance programs: SEOG, College Work Study, and NDSL.

TABLE VI-4

ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS
1977-78

	Federal Financial Aid Programs 1/	Cal Grant A 2/	Cal Grant B 3/	Graduate Fellowship Program 4/	Community College EOPS Program 5/	CSUC EOPS Program 6/	University of California Undergraduate Aid Recipients	University of California Graduate Aid Recipients
American Indian	1.4%	0.5	0.8%	0.4%	2.0	2.0	1.0	0.6
Asian	8.2	14.0	16.1	18.0	11.0	9.5	13.1	8.7
Black	21.1	6.0	21.2	10.7	30.0	42.1	9.1	6.5
Chicano/Latino	16.7	10.0	34.3	20.2	30.0	33.4	11.3	7.8
White	52.6	64.5	21.1	45.1	27.0	13.0	55.6	62.5
Other		5.0	0.4	5.6			9.9	13.9

1/ Data provided by Alex Ratnofsky, Office of Education and Dissemination, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Data apply only to SEOG/CWS/NDSL programs.

2/ Student Aid Commission, Statistics taken from October 1977 Agenda.

3/ Student Aid Commission, Statistics taken from October 1977 Agenda (based upon a 10% random survey).

4/ Student Aid Commission, Statistics taken from October 1977 Agenda, Section J, Enclosure J-3.

5/ Data provided by staff of the California Student Aid Study Group, September 1979. The data for the Community College EOPS program are for 1976-77.

6/ Report on Student Aid, 1977-78, to members of the Committee on Educational Policy, Office of the President, University of California, March 7, 1979, Table 2, page 8.

TABLE VI-5

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST-TIME CAL GRANT (A) SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

Race or Ethnic Group--(Percent Distribution)	1973-74[1]	1974-75[1]	1975-76[1]	1976-77[2]	1977-78[2]	1978-79[2]
American Indian	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.5%
Black	6.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	6.0	6.0
Caucasian	67.0	68.0	69.0	70.0	64.5	64.5
Chicano	9.0	.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	10.0
Filipino	N/A	N/A	1.0	2.0	1.5	1.5
Asian	10.0	12.0	11.0	9.0	12.5	12.5
Other	7.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Decline to State	--	--	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

---

1. Governor's Budget, 1977-78, page 915, Table C.
2. Governor's Budget, 1978-79, page 940, Table C.

TABLE VI-6

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST-TIME CAL GRANT (B) COLLEGE OPPORTUNITY GRANT RECIPIENTS

Race or Ethnic Group--(Percent Distribution):	1972-73[1]	1973-74[2]	1974-75[2]	1975-76[3]	1976-77[4]	1977-78[5]	1978-79[6]
American Indian	1.7%	1.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.5%	0.8%	0.7%
Black	20.5	24.0	20.0	17.1	21.5	21.2	23.9
Caucasian	22.0	18.0	21.0	24.7	22.4	21.2	20.5
Chicano	43.1	41.0	40.0	40.2	39.8	34.3	36.8
Filipino	--	3.0	3.0	4.5	1.3	5.0	2.1
Asian	9.2	10.0	10.0	11.3	9.7	11.1	12.3
Other	3.5	3.0	5.0	1.0	3.8	6.0	3.7
Decline to State	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.4	-0-

---

1. Governor's Budget, 1975-76, page 996, Table B (based upon a 10% sample).
2. Governor's Budget, 1976-77, page 1007, Table B (based upon a 10% random sample).
3. Student Aid Commission, Statistics taken from October 1975 Agenda.
4. Student Aid Commission, Statistics taken from October 1976 Agenda (based upon a 10% random sample).
5. Student Aid Commission, Statistics taken from October 1977 Agenda (based upon a 10% random sample).
6. Student Aid Commission, Statistics taken from October 1978 Agenda (based upon a 10% random sample).

#53-ch/129
rev. 5/24/79

TABLE VI-7

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP RECIPIENTS

Race or Ethnic Group--(Percent Distribution)	1974-75[1]	1975-76[1]	1976-77[1]	1977-78[1]	1978-79[2]
American Indian	--	1.03%	--	.43%	1.0%
Black	1.09%	7.63	9.89%	10.73	7.0
Caucasian	89.07	60.59	55.08	45.06	54.0
Chicano	--	11.50	13.10	20.17	17.0
Filipino	1.09	1.03	.80	--	1.0
Asian	5.46	12.76	15.51	18.03	15.0
Other	3.29	5.46	5.61	5.56	5.0

---

1. California Student Aid Commiss[illegible] Agenda, October 14, 1977, Section J, Enclosure J-3.
2. 1979-80 Governor's Budget, Table A, page 1047.

#53-ch/130
rev. 5/24/79

Among the State-funded programs, Cal Grant B and C, particularly the former, have responded to the needs of low-income students. Approximately 50 percent of first-time Cal Grant B recipients in 1978-79 had parental incomes of less than $6,000. (See Table VI-8.) More than 80 percent of the recipients had parental incomes of less than $9,000, with the median parental income for all Cal Grant B recipients less than $6,000 in 1978-79. The Cal Grant C program also has a high rate of participation by low-income students, with more than 50 percent of first-time recipients in 1978-79 having parental incomes of less than $10,000. The median income of parents of all first-time recipients in 1978-79 was less than $9,000.

Data concerning the Graduate Fellowship Program indicate that the median parental income of recipients falls within a range of $3,000 to $6,000. By contrast, the median parental income of participants in the Cal Grant A program in 1978-79 was $15,367, with only some 17 percent of first-time recipients having parental incomes of less than $9,000.

TABLE VI-8

INCOME DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST-TIME CAL GRANT RECIPIENTS

Parents Net Income--(Percent Distribution)	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
Cal Grant (A)-Scholarship						
Below $6,000	14.1%	11.5%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%	8.0%
$6,000-$8,999	21.4	17.6	11.3	13.0	12.0	9.0
$9,000-$11,999	24.2	23.5	16.6	17.0	16.0	12.0
$12,000-$14,999	20.9	24.7	18.8	16.0	16.0	16.0
$15,000 and Above	19.4	22.8	47.2	46.0	48.0	39.0
Median Income of Parents				$14,286	$14,725	$15,367
Cal Grant (B)-COG						
Below $6,000	54.2%	49.6%	49.0%	49.0%	47.0%	51.0%
$6,000-$8,999	34.9	35.1	35.0	33.0	32.0	31.0
$9,000-$11,999	10.9	15.0	15.0	16.0	19.0	16.0
$12,000 and Above	0.1	.4	1.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Median Income of Parents			$6,500	$6,500	$6,500	$5,955
Cal Grant (C)-OETG						
Below $6,000		39.0%	23.0%	33.0%	30.0%	36.0%
$6,000-$9,999		28.4	25.0	19.0	21.0	20.0
$10,000-$11,999		10.4	12.0	10.0	8.0	8.0
$12,000 and Above		22.1	40.0	38.0	41.0	36.0
Median Income of Parents		$7,863	$10,670	$9,899	$11,368	$8,900

SOURCE: Governor's Budget, 1974-75, 1976-77, 1978-79, and 1979-80.

Data on the sex composition of State student aid recipients are limited. Most of the Cal Grant C awards apparently go to women; in 1977-78, 82 percent of the new recipients were women. By contrast, the majority of Graduate Fellowship recipients have been male, with women receiving less than 40 percent of the awards during the past three years. Data regarding the sex composition of Cal Grant B recipients are not available. Among recipients of federal aid in 1977-78, women received approximately 55 percent of the SEOG, CWS, and NDSL awards in California. Financial aid recipients at the University of California during the same period demonstrate an opposite pattern, with undergraduate men receiving 54 percent of the awards, and graduate men, 63 percent.

Those student assistance programs which relate directly to the goals of student affirmative action have apparently been successful in providing a means for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students to enroll in postsecondary education. Among State-funded programs, the Cal Grant B programs, and the financial components of the EOP/S programs have been particularly important as a source of State funding for such students.

PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED

Financial assistance programs have expanded dramatically during the past five years, and have provided a means for low- and middle-income students to pay a large portion of the cost of their college education. In order to increase the effectiveness of these programs, however, several problems must be resolved. Of particular importance are the following:

- Prospective students essentially have only six weeks--from January 1 to February 11--in which to file applications for financial assistance to the California Student Aid Commission. While application forms are available on November 1, the federal government requires that applications for Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG) not be filed before January 1. The deadline for applications to the Student Aid Commission is February 11. Because the State and federal agencies have differing application filing periods, the prospective student is caught in the middle with only six weeks in which to apply for both.

- The application process, which includes various forms, is complicated and difficult for many prospective students to understand and/or complete accurately. There is a need to simplify the process.

- To be eligible for the Cal Grant B (College Opportunity Grant) Program, prospective students must apply on or before February 11, if they wish to enroll the following fall. This program is intended to serve the needs of students from low-income families. However, prospective students from this economic background traditionally do not make a decision about college until the summer prior to enrollment. In short, the application deadline inhibits the attainment of the goals of the program. Further, prospective students are ineligible for Cal Grant B if they have completed more than one semester of college work. Consequently, students who begin their college work without a Cal Grant B, generally are ineligible to apply later for a Cal Grant B, despite the level of economic need.

- To reduce the possibility of fraud many institutions require parents to submit a copy of their federal income tax form (Form 1040, verified by the IRS) before any financial aid is actually awarded. Since, many low-income families receive some form of public assistance (such as Social Security, AFDC, and/or Veterans Assistance) that is not taxable, many are not required to file Form 1040; consequently, this creates a difficulty in their obtaining financial aid in a timely fashion.

- Students and parents from low-income backgrounds sometimes inflate their financial assets as a result of ignorance and/or in an effort to disguise what they perceive to be poverty. Frequently, indebtedness is viewed as something to be ashamed of and, consequently, full statements of economic need are not provided.

- The federally funded College Work-Study Program provides an excellent opportunity for low-income students to earn money through part-time jobs directly related to their course of study or career plans. In many cases, however, the work-study jobs do not provide meaningful learning experiences or have little relationship to students' career interests.

- For students attending college through financial assistance, the purchase of books and supplies at the start of the term, as well as the payments needed for rent and food, can be serious problems when financial aid is delayed. This is particularly true at institutions on the quarter system, where the term moves more quickly and the student can fall seriously behind if the books are not available during the first two weeks, and/or the student must find an outside job to make an immediate rent payment. Institutional advances on State and federal awards should be available on these campuses to assist the students who face such problems.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The following general conclusions are based on the foregoing assessment of the impact of student financial assistance programs on the goals of student affirmative action:

1. During the past five years there has been a dramatic increase in the amount of financial assistance available at the undergraduate level for low-income students in California institutions. The current problems are not so much inadequate amounts of money as the need to adapt the programs to serve the needs of prospective low-income students more effectively.

   If the application process is made more flexible (in terms of deadline and eligibility) and simplified (in terms of application forms), more low-income students may seek to utilize financial assistance programs, thereby increasing the demand for financial assistance.

2. The bulk of State and federal funds for student financial assistance are targeted for undergraduate students, with

less than 2 percent designated for graduate students. There apparently is a need to increase the amount of financial assistance available for low-income graduate students to pay for a portion of the costs of their education.

3. A better linkage between the State-funded student aid programs and the State-funded EOP/S programs is needed. For example, the goals and purposes of the Cal Grant B program are generally similar to the financial aid component of the Community College EOPS program and the State University EOP program. However, the latter programs are administered at the campus level, while the former program is administered at the statewide level. The need for three different financial assistance programs (Cal Grant B, EOPS, and EOP) administered by three separate State agencies is questionable when the same type of student is to be served by all three.

FOOTNOTES

1/ Federal Student Assistance and Categorical Programs, National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, January 1979, Washington, D.C., p. 51.

2/ Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, 1978 Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, p. 299, as reported in Ibid, National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities, p. 60.

CHAPTER VII

MEETING THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF THE LIMITED-ENGLISH AND NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING PERSONS IN CALIFORNIA

INTRODUCTION

California's racial and ethnic composition is changing rapidly. The growth in the State's ethnic minority population has been accompanied by an increase in the number of residents with limited- or non-English speaking (LES/NES) ability. Studies indicate that the LES/NES population has lower reading rates, higher high school dropout rates, and lower college-going rates. The question of meeting the educational needs of LES/NES persons arises within the context of equal educational opportunity for three reasons. First, there is a need to provide the growing number of LES/NES students enrolled in grades K-12 with the skills needed for success in postsecondary education. Second, there is a need to prepare teachers who are capable of providing effective instruction to LES/NES students. Third, there is a need to assist LES/NES adults in preparing for postsecondary education and meaningful employment.

This chapter provides a closer look at the demographic changes in California, a review of the approaches used at the K-12 level to meet the needs created by these changes, and a discussion of the role of postsecondary institutions in responding to the needs of the limited- or non-English speaking student.

The term LES/NES will be used throughout the chapter to indicate limited-English and non-English speaking abilities. Limited-English speaking persons are those who do not possess clearly developed English-language skills in comprehension, speaking, reading and writing--the skills necessary to benefit from instruction in English at a level substantially equivalent to persons whose primary language is English. Non-English speaking persons are those who communicate only in their primary language.

POPULATION TRENDS

Recent studies indicate that California's population increased by 11.6 percent between April 1970 and July 1976--from 19,971,069 to 22,297,000 people. 1/ The 1970 Census reported that 3,101,589, or 15.54 percent, of California's 19.9 million residents were Spanish speaking. By July 1978 the number of such residents had risen to 3,409,900, or 15.84 percent of the State's 21.5 million residents. 2/

Statewide population trends for minority groups whose language is other than Spanish are more difficult to determine accurately because they are generally combined under classifications such as "Other," Asian/Pacific Islander" or "Other Non-white." However, an analysis of population changes in specific metropolitan areas may provide a clearer picture of California's changing racial/ethnic composition. Two of California's major metropolitan areas--Los Angeles and San Francisco--illustrate what is occurring in other parts of the State.

In Los Angeles County, the largest in the State, racial and ethnic minorities made up nearly one-third (32.8%) of the population in 1970.

TABLE VII-1

LOS ANGELES COUNTY POPULATION BY ETHNICITY (1970)

	Number	Percent
White	4,717,188	67.1%
Spanish	1,289,311	18.3
Black	762,844	10.8
All Others*	262,732	3.7
Total	7,032,075	99.9%

---

*Includes American Indians, Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, and all others.

Source: Racial and Ethnic Population Groups Within the Cities and Unincorporated Places in Los Angeles County, April 1970. Population and Human Resources Section, Department of Regional Planning, County of Los Angeles, March 1978.

By July 1, 1977, the County population had grown to 7,060,700. Evidence from elementary school enrollments and two special censuses suggest that the increase was due primarily to an infusion of Hispanic residents. 3/

Table VII-2 indicates that births in Los Angeles County are increasing while deaths are declining. The year 1977 marked the third consecutive year in which births increased and the fourth in which deaths declined. As Table VII-2 also shows, the record of white births is in distinct contrast to ethnic minority births. For

example, the number of white births declined steadily from a decade high of 73,903 in 1970 to a decade low of 40,876 in 1975. After a small increase in 1976, white births increased to 44,675 in 1977. In contrast, births to "other non-whites," a group primarily composed of Asians, grew steadily throughout the decade, while the number of children born to women with Spanish surnames grew from 33,706 in 1970 to 50,863 in 1976.

TABLE VII-2

BIRTHS AND DEATHS BY ETHNIC GROUP 1970-1977 LOS ANGELES COUNTY

	Total	White	Spanish Surname	Black	All Other Non-White
BIRTHS (Live)					
1970	131,915	73,903	33,706	19,150	5,156
1971	115,956	58,080	36,207	16,540	5,129
1972	107,249	50,340	36,601	15,018	5,290
1973	111,353	45,581	43,993	16,173	5,606
1974	108,324	41,940	45,113	15,799	5,472
1975	110,960	40,876	47,979	16,340	5,765
1976	115,590	41,366	50,863	16,976	6,385
1977	117,420	44,675	48,263	17,426	7,056
1970-77	918,767	396,761	342,725	133,422	45,859
% of Total	100.0	43.2	37.3	14.5	5.0
DEATHS					
1970	61,529	51,222	3,834	5,584	889
1971	62,626	51,355	4,490	5,794	987
1972	59,639	48,709	4,279	5,736	915
1973	64,011	51,778	4,806	6,357	1,070
1974	59,278	47,820	4,445	6,035	978
1975	59,044	46,927	4,941	6,080	1,096
1976	58,289	45,710	5,415	6,123	1,041
1977	56,388	43,917	5,062	6,232	1,177
1970-77	480,804	387,438	37,272	47,941	8,153
% of Total	100.0	80.5	7.8	10.0	1.7

Source: Los Angeles County Department of Health Services

#53-mj/120
rev. 4/4/79

Moreover, an analysis of the net natural population increase (births minus deaths) indicates that nearly 70 percent of the growth in the Los Angeles County was due to the excess of births over deaths among the Spanish-surname population, as shown by Table VII-3. Table VII-3 also shows that the white population accounted only for slightly more than 2 percent of the net natural increase.

TABLE VII-3

NET NATURAL INCREASE
LOS ANGELES COUNTY 1970 THROUGH 1977

	Net Natural Increase		Total	Total
	Percent	Number	Births	Deaths
Spanish Surname	69.74%	305,453	342,725	37,272
Black	19.52	85,481	133,422	47,941
Other* Non-White	8.61	37,706	45,859	8,153
White	2.13	9,323	396,761	387,438
Total	100.00%	437,963	918,767	480,804

---

*This group is primarily composed of Asians.

Source: Quarterly Bulletin Advance Release. Population and Human Resources Section, Department of Regional Planning, County of Los Angeles, November 1978.

The City of Los Angeles reports an even more significant increase in its Spanish-surname, Asian, and American-Indian populations. Table VII-4 summarizes the citywide figures.

TABLE VII-4

LOS ANGELES CITY POPULATION BY ETHNICITY, 1970-1977

	1970		1977		Change 70-77	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Spanish-Surname	519,842	18.5%	681,863	23.5%	162,021	31.2%
Black	486,674	17.3	513,941	17.7	27,267	5.7
Asian	104,937	3.7	182,956	6.3	78,019	74.3
White	1,691,296	60.1	1,495,247	51.6	-196,049	-11.6
American Indian	9,350	0.3	26,631	0.9	17,281	184.8
TOTAL	2,812,099	99.9%	2,900,638	100.0%	88,539	3.2%

Source: October 1977 Estimate of Population by Race. Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles, August 1978.

In San Francisco, the population decreased from 712,100 in 1970 to 665,000 in 1976. There is little data available on the current racial/ethnic distribution of the overall population in the San Francisco area, but the K-12 school enrollments (Table VII-5) provide some indication of the demographic changes which have taken place over the past eight years.

TABLE VII-5

SAN FRANCISCO K-12 ENROLLMENTS BY ETHNICITY 1971-79

	1971	1979
White	31.7	20.5
Black	30.4	27.7
Chinese	13.8	18.7
Spanish-Surname	13.7	15.3
Filipino	5.8	8.8
Japanese	1.8	1.5
Other Non-white*		5.7
Korean	.3	1.1
American Indian	.4	.6
Total K-12 Enrollment	83,545	60,245

---

*Includes Vietnamese, Samoan and Indo-Chinese groups.

Source: San Francisco Unified School District

Table VII-5 suggests that, while there has been a 28 percent decline in the overall K-12 enrollment, the proportions of Chinese, Filipino, and other non-white students have increased. The Black and Spanish-surname student populations have remained fairly stable, but the white student population has decreased dramatically. The combination of these factors accounts for the change in the racial/ethnic composition of the students in the San Francisco public schools. It is reasonable to assume that similar changes are occurring in the overall population of the San Francisco area.

The preceding discussion indicates that ethnic minorities are expected to comprise an increasing proportion of California's population. While population projections for 1990 vary considerably--the Department of Water Resources estimates 26.1 million; the Department of Finance estimates 26.3; and the office of former Lieutenant Governor Dymally estimated 31.5--it is clear that the increase in the State's population over the next decade primarily will be a result of the steady growth of its minority population.

CALIFORNIA'S CHANGING POPULATION AND THE NEED FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

LES/NES Students in the Public Schools

California's changing ethnic composition is perhaps most evident in the public school system. The State Department of Education recently reported that, in October 1977, 36.5 percent of the nearly 4.3 million students in grades K-12 were members of racial and ethnic minorities, as compared to 25 percent in 1967. Of these students, nearly 21 percent were Hispanic; 10 percent, Black; 3.5 percent, Asian or Pacific Islander; about 1 percent, Filipino; and about 1 percent, American Indian. Hispanic students registered the largest numerical increase--from 616,226 in 1967 to 892,113 in 1977, an increase of nearly 45 percent. 4/

There is a positive correlation between the growing numbers of Hispanic and other minority-language students in grades K-12 and the growing proportion of LES/NES students. The State Department of Education recently reported that the total number of LES/NES students reported by school districts in the Fall 1977 census was 233,444. 5/ (See Table VII-6.)

TABLE VII-6

LIMITED- AND NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA BY DOMINANT LANGUAGE

Fall 1977

Dominant Language Non-English	Number of NES and LES Students (K-12)	Percent of Total
Spanish	195,673	83.80
Cantonese	4,390	1.80
Mandarin	1,310	.56
Vietnamese	5,819	2.49
Korean	4,271	1.82
Japanese	2,034	.87
Tagalog	5,670	2.42
Ilocano	919	.39
Samoan	1,152	.49
Portuguese	1,882	.80
American Indian	218	.09
Others	10,108	4.32
Total	233,444	99.90

Source: Fall 1977 census mandated by AB 1329. Management Information Center, State Department of Education.

The number of LES/NES students is expected to increase in the coming years. The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL) projected LES/NES enrollments of 277,765 for Fall 1978 and 328,884 for Fall 1979. 6/ As these enrollments increase so will the need to provide instruction in a manner that is comprehensible and that provides these students with the skills needed for success in school.

Educational Needs of LES/NES Adults

While there is little data on the number of California adults with limited-English speaking ability, national data suggest that the challenge in meeting the educational needs of this adult population is even greater than at the K-12 level. These adults tend to have less schooling and comprise a greater proportion of the population. For example, in March 1976, 39 percent of the Spanish-surnamed adults in the United States 25 years old and over were high school graduates, as compared to 64 percent of the overall population in that age group. 7/ A breakdown of the Spanish-surnamed population by place of origin was: Puerto Rican, 29.8 percent; Mexican, 32.5 percent; Cuban, 51.5 percent; and Other Spanish (includes Central and South American), 60.3 percent.

Furthermore, although only 3.8 percent of all persons 25 years old and over in the United States in 1976 had completed less than five years of school, 18.7 percent of those with Spanish surnames had completed less than five. The breakdown of those by origin was: Mexican, 24.2 percent; Puerto Rican, 18.7 percent; Cuban, 9.5 percent; and Other Spanish, 7.0 percent.

A special census report issued in July 1976 indicated that the percentage of persons having difficulty with English tended to be higher among adults than among elementary and high school age youth. 8/ Presumably, there is greater exposure to English among persons in the 6- to 17-year-old group, most of whom are enrolled in school.

Although a precise count of the limited- and non-English speaking adults in California does not exist, it is clear that they represent a sizeable portion of the Chicano and Asian populations.

The role of postsecondary institutions in general, and the Community Colleges in particular, in determining and addressing the educational needs of this group is discussed later in this chapter.

Meeting the Educational Needs of LES/NES Students

Concern over the special needs of the growing numbers of children with limited-English speaking ability began to develop during the 1960s. One of the reasons for this concern was the documentation of differences in the years of schooling attained by the Spanish-surnamed population, as compared to the white population. Table VII-7 graphically displays those differences.

TABLE VII-7

MEDIAN YEARS OF SCHOOLING COMPLETED BY ADULTS 25 YEARS AND OLDER IN 1950, 1960, AND 1970 IN THE SOUTHWEST

	1950		1960		1970					
	Total Pop.	WPSS*	Total Pop.	WPSS*	Total Pop.		Black		Mexican-Amer.	
					Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Arizona	10.0	6.0	11.2	7.0	12.3	12.2	9.4	9.9	9.3	8.8
California	11.6	7.8	12.1	8.6	12.4	12.3	11.9	12.0	10.8	10.4
Colorado	10.9	6.5	12.1	8.2	12.4	12.4	12.2	12.2	10.0	9.8
New Mexico	9.3	6.1	11.2	7.4	12.2	12.2	11.1	10.6	9.8	9.6
Texas	9.3	3.5	10.4	4.8	11.7	11.6	9.3	10.0	7.6	7.0

---

*WPSS means White Person of Spanish Surname, a category used by the United States Bureau of the Census in 1950 and 1960. It is roughly equivalent to Mexican American. In the 1970 Census the Bureau employed the category of Mexican ethnic origin. The two categories are fairly comparable. (1970 statistics represent all specified populations in the United States--not just the five southwestern states.)

Source: Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change. Thomas P. Carter and Roberto D. Segura, The College Board, New York, 1979.

It is apparent from Table VII-7 that persons of Spanish-speaking origin obtain less education than the total population. While this same group remains in school longer in California than it does in the southwestern states, the picture remains grim.

Concern for the special educational needs of this group increased as the problems became more thoroughly documented. The 40 percent drop-out rate among Spanish-surnamed students, as compared to 14 percent for Anglo children, is only one example of the evidence. 9/ By the mid-1960s, a number of studies had shown the relationship between dropping out and poor reading achievement. 10/ The Pentry (1959) study, for example, showed that while 15 percent of the students in the top quartile of reading achievement dropped out of school, 50 percent of those in the lowest quartile also dropped out. Other studies have shown the disproportionate numbers of ethnic minorities in the lowest quartile of reading achievement: 50 to 70 percent of K-12 minority students below grade level, as compared to 25 to 34 percent of Anglo students.

The combination of these factors--low educational attainment, high drop-out rate, and poor reading achievement--led educators to conclude that traditional means of educating American (English-dominant) students were not as effective for students of limited- or non-English speaking ability. Educators then introduced a new approach to teaching English as a Second Language (ESL). ESL has been defined as an immersion program which provides supplementary instruction in English for a specified period, generally thirty minutes to one hour daily. English is used almost exclusively as the medium of instruction regardless of the student's understanding of the language. The theory behind ESL is that a non-English speaking person can become proficient in the language through a brief period of daily training in English. This method does not make use of the tools the LES/NES person brings to school--e.g., his or her native language--but requires that the student function in an English-language setting for the majority of the school day.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) has recognized the utility of ESL as a component of bilingual education programs. However, the Lau Guidelines, written under the auspices of HEW, specifically state that ESL, when used alone, does not provide LES/NES students with equality of opportunity for a meaningful education. Consequently, ESL programs when used alone have not been acceptable as an approach to respond to the needs of LES/NES students.

Bilingual education has been defined as the utilization of a student's native language as a medium of instruction while English is being acquired as a second language. In bilingual education, instruction is not restricted to the acquisition of basic language skills; it extends to the development of skills in other subjects such as history, science, and mathematics so that overall cognitive development is not hindered.

"Transitional" and "maintenance" are terms which frequently enter into discussions of approaches to bilingual education. The transitional approach focuses exclusively on providing bilingual services for the LES/NES student until he or she can function successfully in English; then the student is transferred to an English-only classroom. The maintenance approach defines bilingual education as an "integrated" educational experience in which all children are presented with an opportunity to communicate and to value their respective cultural heritages. Consequently, the maintenance approach supports the concurrent development of both the student's primary language and English.

The concept of dual language instruction became an acceptable teaching methodology and was given official support with the passage of the federal Bilingual Education Act of 1968, often referred to as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). (Appendix C provides the federal and State bases for bilingual education.) Title VII represents the most comprehensive funding source for bilingual education. (See Table VII-8.) These grants are awarded by the U.S. Office of Education on a competitive basis. During the 1977-78 school year, there were 135 bilingual education programs operated under Title VII in California.

Subsequent to the passage of Title VII, the California Legislature enacted the Bilingual Education Act of 1972 (AB 2284) which contained an appropriation of $5 million. The passage of AB 2284 marked the first time State funds were authorized for school districts that wished to establish bilingual education programs. Implementation of both the federal and State Acts has been beset by many problems. Unfortunately, neither Act provided a clear definition of a bilingual program nor specific guidelines for evaluating the program. In addition, the legislation did not recognize either the need for teachers able to teach academic subjects in two languages or the need for bilingual materials.

Fortunately, however, 1975 revisions in Title VII legislation resulted in substantial improvements in the program's implementation: the definition of a bilingual education program was clarified; the development of replicable model projects was emphasized; teacher in-service training became a mandatory component; guidelines for the evaluation of projects were specified; and technical assistance centers were set up to develop, assess, and disseminate bilingual curriculum materials.

In December of 1975, the California State Board of Education adopted the following policy on services to limited-English speaking students:

> To comply with the *Lau* v. *Nichols* Supreme Court Decision, schools should make provisions for instruction in a language understandable to each limited English speaking student until such student can adequately understand instruction in English. Therefore, each limited English speaking student in the public schools should have, in addition to or in combination with other educational opportunities, educational services which:
>
> > are taught in a language understandable to the student;
> >
> > build upon the student's primary language; and
> >
> > teach the student English. [11]

(Note: The *Lau* v. *Nichols* decision affirmed that school districts must offer children who speak little or no English special language programs which provide them with an equal educational opportunity.)

The following year, California enacted the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual Bicultural Education Act of 1976 (Chapter 5.76, *California Education Code*). The Act made bilingual education mandatory in any school which has ten or more LES/NES students with the same primary language enrolled in any grade between K-6. The Act also specified bilingual program approaches for different types of students and established evaluation guidelines (Appendix D). The State Department of Education received $250,000 for improved coordination between State and local projects, and $3 million was allocated to school districts to provide additional services for LES/NES students. Table VII-8 summarizes the federal and State funds that have been made available in California for bilingual education.

TABLE VII-8

CALIFORNIA BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM FUNDING (K-12)
1969-1978

	Federal Funded ESEA Title VII Dollar Amounts	State Funded AB 2284 & AB 1329 Dollar Amounts	Combined State & Federal Funding Totals
1969-70	$ 3,521,335	- - - - - - - - -	$ 3,521,335
1970-71	7,291,886	- - - - - - - - -	7,291,886
1971-72	7,535,949	- - - - - - - - -	7,535,949
1972-73	10,421,000	$ 1,000,000	11,421,000
1973-74	10,540,691	3,800,000	14,340,691
1974-75	16,741,476	3,886,200	20,627,676
1975-76	17,323,527 1/	8,139,808	25,463,335
1976-77	18,932,549	8,139,808	27,072,357
1977-78	23,767,845	11,628,808	35,396,653

Source: State Department of Education. Education for Limited English Speaking and Non-English Speaking Students, Part I, April 1978.

Table VII-9 indicates the amount of Title VII funding provided to postsecondary institutions for teacher training. Subpart C of the Act provides funds for the training of teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, teacher aides, parents, and other persons associated with bilingual education. Subpart D provides financial assistance to institutions for training persons to conduct programs emphasizing opportunities for career development, advancement, and lateral mobility. Fellowships are awarded to individuals to enroll full time in a program to prepare teacher trainers in bilingual education.

TABLE VII-9

ESEA TITLE VII INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
(Subparts C, D and E)
FY 1977-78

Projects	Subpart C	Subpart D	Subpart E	Total Amounts
4 Training Resources Centers	$1,700,000			$ 1,700,000
3 Materials Development Centers	1,207,000			1,207,000
1 Dissemination/ Assessment Center	425,000			425,000
24 Training Programs		$2,404,668		2,404,668
10 Institutions at 166 Fellowships			$5,733,668	5,733,668
Totals	$3,332,000	$2,404,668	$5,733,668	$11,470,336

Source: State Department of Education. Education for Limited-English Speaking and Non-English Speaking Students, Part I, April 1978.

It should be noted that there were two major bilingual education bills proposed during the 1978-79 legislative session--Assembly Bill 507 (Chacon) and Assembly Bill 690 (Alatorre). Both bills would significantly alter the Chacon-Moscone Act of 1976. While neither of the bills was passed, the discussion of bilingual education is expected to resume during the 1979-80 session. It is clear, however, that whichever bill is passed there will be a continued need for more bilingual teachers in California.

Evaluations of Bilingual Education

Although bilingual education is a relatively new approach to teaching LES/NES children, several evaluations of these programs have been conducted. Some of these evaluations show increased learning when students are taught in a bilingual setting; others have found little or no improvement.

Recent assessments of the available research indicate that bilingual education for LES/NES students is effective in certain achievement areas. 12/ Dulay and Burt reviewed 38 research projects and 175 project evaluations to determine whether they met minimum research design standards and to examine their findings. Studies showing any of the following weaknesses were eliminated from the study:

1. No control for subjects' socio-economic status;
2. No control for initial language proficiency or dominance;
3. No baseline comparison data or control group;
4. Inadequate sample size;
5. Excessive attrition rate;
6. Significant differences in teacher qualification for control and experimental groups; and
7. Insufficient data and/or statistics reported.

The findings of the nine research studies and three demonstration projects that survived the selection process are summarized in Table VII-10, which follows. In reviewing Dulay's and Burt's findings, the reader should be aware of the following definitions of terms used by the authors in the table:

"Positive effect" as used in this study means one of the following:

- The experimental group performed significantly better than the comparison group;
- Pre-post gains during treatment were significantly greater than gains before treatment; or
- Results of comparison to district or national norms were significantly better after treatment than before treatment.

"No effect" means no significant differences were found in one of the conditions listed. "Negative effect" means subjects performed significantly worse in one of the conditions listed above.

An analysis of Table VII-10 indicates that students in bilingual programs perform significantly better than students in monolingual programs in the areas of first-language reading, language arts, science, and mathematics. The findings also indicate that the cognitive function of students in bilingual programs--as measured through the first language, second language, and non-verbally--is generally better than students in monolingual programs. One finding indicated a negative effect of bilingual programs on second-language reading and language arts, seven found no effect, and six found a positive effect.

This research summary reflects results of bilingual education programs during the first ten years of the experimental operation. Nevertheless, 58 percent of the findings indicate that bilingual education worked significantly better than monolingual programs for LES/NES students, 41 percent indicate no effect, and 1 percent indicate a negative effect.

Conversely, a study conducted by the American Institute for Research (AIR) for the U.S. Office of Education is less optimistic. The purpose of the AIR evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of Spanish/English bilingual programs funded under Title VII. The AIR evaluation covered thirty-eight different sites across the United States during the 1975-76 school year.

TABLE VII-10

NUMBER OF RESEARCH FINDINGS ACCORDING TO EFFECT OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE

Student Performance Variables	Positive Effect	No Effect	Negative Effect	#Findings in Category
First Language Reading and Language Arts Demonstration Project Evaluation (DPE), Alice, Texas, 1973-74 (gr. 1-4); DPE, Corpus Christi, Texas, 1973-74 (gr. 1-3); Cohen, 1972 (gr. 2).	6	2		8
Second Language Oral Proficiency Taylor, 1969, (gr. 4-5); Cohen, 1972, (gr. 2)		3		3
Second Language Reading and Language Arts DPE, Alice, Texas, 1973-74, (gr.1-4); DPE, Corpus Christi, Texas, 1973-74, (gr.1-3); Ramos, et al., 1967, (gr.4-6); Modiano, 1968, (gl); Balasubrumonian, et al., 1973, (gr.K, 2, 3); Cohen, 1972, (gr.2)	6	7	1	14
Social Studies Achievement (measured in the second language) Ramos, et al., 1967, (gr.4-6)	1	1		2
Science/Math Achievement (measured in the Second language DPE, Houston, Texas, 1972-73, (gr.1-4); DPE, Corpus Christi, Texas, 1973-74, (gr.1-3); Trevino, 1968, (gr.1-3); Cohen, 1972, (gr.2)	10	4		14
Cognitive Function (measured non-verbally Cohen, 1972, (gr.2)	1			1
Cognitive Function (measured through the first language DPE, Alice, Texas, 1973-74, (gr.K-4)	3	2		5
Cognitive Function (measured through the second language DPE, Alice, Texas, 1973-74, (gr.K-4); DPE, Houston, Texas, 1972-73, (gr.K-4)	6	4		10
Attitude Toward Self and Own Culture Cohen, 1972, (gr.2)		1		1
School Attendance Cohen, 1972, (gr.2)	1			1
Totals	34 (58%)	24 (41%)	1 (01%)	59

Source: Dulay, H., and Burt, M., *Bilingual Education: A Close Look at its Effects*. Forum, February 1979.

The major findings of the AIR study are summarized below:

- Approximately 75 percent of the students enrolled were of Hispanic origin.
- Achievement gains in reading and mathematical computation in the program were neither significantly nor substantially different from what would have been expected without participation in the program.
- In English reading, the percentile rank of the average Hispanic student remained at approximately the same level between Fall 1975 and Fall 1976 (approximately 20th percentile for second and third graders).
- Participation in the program did not bring about a more positive student attitude toward school and school-related activities.
- There was an increase in the scores on the Spanish reading test between the pre-test and post-test during the 1975-76 school year for students in the program.
- While 65 percent of the Title VII teachers and 65 percent of the aides said that they had had two years or more of bilingual teaching experience, only 50 percent of the teachers said that they were proficient in both Spanish and English. A larger proportion of the teacher aides, 65 percent, said that they had two years or more of bilingual teaching experience, and 66 percent said that they were proficient in both languages.

The AIR report, Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program, has proven to be controversial and has been heavily criticized by a number of educational researchers. 13/ Most of the controversy surrounds the methodology used in the evaluation. Critics also argue that the AIR evaluation, like many studies, fails to isolate important variables that relate to program efficiency; e.g., competency of staff, availability of instructional materials, and method of teaching. Instead, critics claim the variables have been aggregated in judging the achievement scores of students in the program, with the result that it is judged on its level of funding, e.g., number of students enrolled, cost per student, etc.

The efficacy of bilingual programs cannot be evaluated adequately without considering the important variables that affect program efficiency--staffing patterns and competencies (half of the teachers in the AIR study were monolingual English speakers), study grouping, methodological approaches, curriculum and instructional materials, etc.

The Effectiveness of Bilingual Education

While consensus on the effectiveness of bilingual education has not been reached, several points can be made on the basis of the literature. First, regardless of the methodology used to determine the viability of bilingual education, the data are for 1975-76. The major definition of bilingual education in California did not occur until 1976, with the passage of AB 1329 (Chapter 978, Statutes of 1976).

Second, research on California's bilingual education programs is too limited to provide a valid measurement of the outcomes. Also, few of the research designs have been sophisticated enough to determine the variables that contribute to, or detract from, the effectiveness of the program. Clearly, there is a need to monitor effectively the State and federal investment in bilingual education.

The third point is that the rationale underlying the bilingual approach has been demonstrated--as English is being learned as a second language the student can proceed with cognitive development and skill acquisition in the native language. Nearly all of the studies indicate that bilingual education has a positive effect in some areas of student performance, as measured in both the students' first and second languages.

Fourth, school districts generally have to identify, recruit, employ, or train the staff necessary to implement an effective program. Clearly, the need for bilingual teachers has become apparent at the same time affirmative action programs are seeking qualified minority candidates in all career fields. However, a recent survey conducted by the State Department of Education indicated that only 30 percent of bilingual classrooms were staffed by teachers with appropriate credentials. This suggests that (1) teacher aides play a major role in bilingual classrooms, and (2) there is a need to recruit new staff or train existing staff to teach in bilingual classrooms.

Fifth, an answer to the question, "Does bilingual education work?," will not come readily. There is some evidence that bilingual education is an effective approach in certain areas--e.g., mathematics, science, and cognitive and first language development. However, if a deeper understanding of students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds is to be gained, educators must undertake empirically sound, longitudinal research and evaluation to determine where bilingual education does and does not work.

Finally, there is a great deal of support for bilingual education among ethnic minority communities. Much of the support is based on the recognition that the public schools have failed to educate many of the linguistically different students. The failure of traditional programs (as evidenced by dropout rates, retention in grades, and student underachievement), coupled with existing evidence that bilingual education is effective in certain areas, should provide a reason for optimism about the potential value of bilingual education for limited- and non-English speaking students.

Role of Postsecondary Institutions in Responding to the Needs of LES/NES Students

The role of postsecondary institutions in responding to the needs of limited- and non-English speaking students has traditionally been in teacher education and teacher preparation. More recently, however, the California State University and Colleges has developed a program with local high school districts which is designed to identify, recruit, prepare, and place increased numbers of Chicano/Hispanic students as bilingual-bicultural elementary and secondary teachers. The University of San Francisco has developed a comprehensive program to train bilingual vocational teachers. A number of Community Colleges have implemented bilingual programs designed to teach English to limited-English speaking adults while providing them with training in a vocational or general education program. Many adult education programs also include courses in English as a Second Language.

The Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL) recently reported that it has approved sixty-seven bilingual-crosscultural emphasis and specialist programs (Table VII-11.) 14/ The emphasis program prepares candidates to teach in bilingual classrooms by providing them with special teaching techniques in the target language. Knowledge of the culture and proficiency in the language of the students to be taught also are emphasized. This preparation generally takes place within the undergraduate program. The specialist program is a graduate program which provides advanced specialization in the language and culture of the target bilingual population and in bilingual teaching methods and techniques. It generally requires a full year of post-baccalaureate work.

TABLE VII-11

NUMBER OF APPROVED BILINGUAL PROGRAMS
1974-78

	Emphasis Programs			Specialist Programs			
Year	CSUC	UC	Independent	CSUC	UC	Independent	Total
1974-75				11	2		13
1975-76				24	2		26
1976-77	12	4		25	2		43
1977-78	16	5	7	26	2	8	64
As of 9/1/78	17	6	8	26	2	8	67

Source: Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Report on the Supply and Demand for Bilingual Teachers in School Districts in California, September 1978.

The CTPL reports that there were 3,551 teachers authorized to teach in bilingual classrooms as of October 1, 1978. The breakdown of these 3,551 individuals by language is shown in Table VII-12.

TABLE VII-12

LANGUAGE AUTHORIZATION OF TEACHERS LISTED IN THE OCTOBER 1, 1978 BILINGUAL DIRECTORY

Language	Total Number of Teachers	% of Total
Spanish	3,300	95.000
Cantonese	93	1.400
Filipino	48	1.200
Vietnamese	30	.887
Portuguese	27	.600
Punjabi	14	.200
Japanese	10	.200
Korean	8	.100
Black	7	.100
Mandarin	10	.200
Cambodian	1	.030
Samoan	1	.030
American Indian	2	.060
Total	3,551	100.000%

Source: Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Report on the Supply and Demand for Bilingual Teachers in School Districts in California, September 1978.

In the same report, the CTPL also describes the shortage of bilingual teachers to meet the demands of limited- and non-English speaking students (Table VII-13).

TABLE VII-13

COMPARISON OF SUPPLY OF AND PROJECTED DEMAND FOR BILINGUAL TEACHERS 1978-79

Language	Supply	Projected Demand at Three Levels of Implementation			Supply as Percent of Demand at Three Levels of Implementation		
		High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low
Spanish	3,794	12,806	11,011	9,430	30%	34%	40%
Filipino	54	420	361	307	13	15	18
Vietnamese	34	332	286	243	10	12	14
Cantonese	100	268	231	196	35	43	51
Korean	9	255	219	186	3.5	4	5
Portuguese	30	122	105	89	25	29	34
Japanese	11	133	114	98	8	10	11
Mandarin	11	75	64	55	15	17	20
Samoan	1	74	63	54	1	1	1
American Indian	3	13	11	9	23	27	33
All Others	24	598	514	437	4	4.6	5.4
Punjabi 15							
Cambodian 1							
Black 8							
Total	4,071	15,096	12,979	11,114			

Note: The "Supply" column includes 520 individuals who have completed an approved program but who, as of September 1978, had not yet applied for the credential. The language authorization for those individuals has been projected on the basis of the distribution of language authorization of the 3,551 credentialed teachers listed in Table VII-12.

Source: Report on the Supply and Demand for Bilingual Teachers in School Districts in California, September 1978. Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

Table VII-13 indicates that California has a supply of 3,794 Spanish/English bilingual teachers for the current academic year.

This figure represents 30 percent of the 12,806 bilingual teachers needed for a maximum implementation of bilingual programs, and 40 percent of the 9,430 needed for mimimal implementation.

The supply of Cantonese/English bilingual teachers represents 35 percent of the need at a maximum level of implementation and 51 percent of the need at a mimimum level. Further analysis indicates that the supplies of Samoan, Korean, and Japanese bilingual teachers are among the lowest. For example, there is only one Samoan/English bilingual teacher, while there is a need for 74 at the maximum level of implementation, and 54 at the minimum level.

The high, medium, and low levels of implementation are projections based on the Education Code sections containing the statutory and regulatory requirements for providing educational services to LES/NES students (Appendix E). The Education Code basically requires school districts to provide a bilingual teacher in grades K-6 where there are ten or more LES/NES students with the same primary language in the same grade or age group, a provision that determines the maximum level of need. The requirements for schools where there are less than ten such students in the same grade or age group are of such a general nature that they are open to a wide interpretation, i.e., low to medium level of implementation. Schools in this category are required to have the "educational services of a bilingual teacher available." Similar provisions apply to LES/NES students in grades 7-12, regardless of the number per grade level or age group.

Above all else, it is clear that there continues to be a need for bilingual teachers qualified to meet the educational needs of the LES/NES students. As briefly noted earlier, the State University plans to respond to this need through a joint effort with the Los Angeles Unified School District. The plan encompasses pairing high schools with State University campuses, special advisement programs, community outreach efforts, paraprofessional activities, media campaigns, and in-service training programs designed to attract more ethnic minority students to postsecondary education and to prepare and place them as bilingual/bicultural teachers and counselors in the public schools. The plan will be implemented during 1979-80.

The Legislature has also provided support for the training of bilingual teachers through authorization of the Bilingual Teacher Corps (Chapter 1496, Statutes of 1974). The Corps provides a career ladder designed to assist bilingual classroom aides in attaining professional certification as bilingual teachers. The legislation provided planning grants to postsecondary institutions for program development. It also provided for stipends and necessary expenses to be paid to Corps members through the institutions where they were enrolled.

The program was implemented in 1975 with 24 institutions and 379 students participating. In 1976-77, the program was expanded to include 33 institutions and 575 students, and in 1977-78, 37 institutions and 803 (full-time equivalent) students. The bulk of the Corps members are now in their senior year of college. However, it is estimated that sixty members earned their bilingual credential in 1977-78. 15/ While a larger proportion of Corps participants begin their training in Community Colleges, some have also been identified as upper-division students at four-year institutions.

As a result of recent legislative action, the Bilingual Teacher Corps has been expanded to include 1,200 participants during the current year. (See the section in this chapter entitled, "The Need for Cooperation in Bilingual Programs.")

The University of San Francisco has developed a program to respond to the critical shortage of bilingual vocational teachers. A Comprehensive Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program will provide in-service training to thirty Chinese-speaking and thirty Spanish-speaking vocational teachers and counselors during 1978-79. The program seeks to produce more effective vocational teachers and counselors by (1) providing participants with theories and methods for bilingual instruction in vocational education, (2) upgrading skills in vocational areas, and (3) raising the level of skills in both languages. The program is being funded by the Bureau of Vocational Education of the U.S. Office of Education. It is anticipated that this program will provide a model that can be replicated to serve other linguistic minorities.

Beyond the need to reduce the shortage of bilingual teachers for grades K-12, it is becoming increasingly important for postsecondary institutions to give attention to the educational needs of LES/NES adults in their respective communities. The California Community Colleges have perhaps the greatest opportunity to respond to the needs of this group.

With cutbacks in funding for adult education, the need for Community Colleges to address the needs of this group is even more critical. Preliminary surveys reveal that there has been an overall cut of 50 percent in adult education programs statewide, with perhaps as many as 1,000,000 students affected by the cutback. 16/

Several Community Colleges have already begun to respond to this need by exploring several approaches. While a more thorough report on this subject is being prepared by the Community College Chancellor's Office, it is appropriate to mention a few of the Community Colleges that are using a bilingual/bicultural approach. Among them are Chabot, Canada, Santa Barbara, Santa Ana, Moorpark, Ventura, and Oxnard.

The Chabot College program initially experienced difficulties in recruiting instructors who could function effectively in both English and Spanish. Attracting students was equally difficult because going to college is generally a foreign experience for LES/NES students. The problem was overcome by co-sponsorship of courses with agencies already serving the Spanish-speaking community.

While the courses initially centered around special-interest topics such as "Self-Help Health," "First Aid for Elders," "Ballet Folklorico," and "Working with the Bilingual Child," regular course offerings such as "Introduction to Sociology" and "Mathematics" were added at the request of students.

Cañada College initially offered courses in English as a Second Language. Subsequently, courses were developed to provide the first two years of a bilingual/bicultural teacher aide training program.

Santa Barbara Community College, which offers the nations only comprehensive two-year program to train geoscience technicians for employment in the petroleum industry, has provided opportunities for bilingual students (Spanish/English) preparing for employment with American firms in Latin America. Since 1977, these opportunities have included the translation of instructional materials into Spanish, the use of bilingual instructional assistants in the teaching of geoscience courses, and coordination with the ESL and EOP programs on campus.

Santa Ana Community College has developed a bilingual secretarial/clerical program to prepare students with a Spanish language background to compete in the business world. The primary objectives of the program are to master secretarial/clerical skills and learn the correct use of English and Spanish.

Moorpark College offers thirty-five bilingual courses, which vary from the academic (anthropology, English, history, and political science) to the vocational (automotive repair, electronics and secretarial science).

The Ventura College Bilingual Vocational Education Program (BVEP) is in its fourth year of operation. Like the Chabot program, it originally operated out of a community center located in Fillmore. Two-and-one-half years later, the program was relocated to the Ventura campus. The BVEP offers programs in secretarial science, basic mechanics, and health-aide training. The main objective of the program has been to train LES/NES adults for entry-level employment. Last year, 60 percent of the students were placed in jobs. This year, the goal is to direct more students into regular (non-bilingual) courses once they have acquired sufficient basic skills.

Oxnard Community College has developed a similar program designed to serve the rural community. It is commonly referred to as "Project Espiga."

The success of these programs is evidenced by the successful placement of students either in a job or in the regular Community College program. In addition, the high response--e.g., Project Espiga enrolled over 140 students in Fall 1978--indicates a need for these programs in limited- and non-English speaking communities.

The major problems confronting each of these bilingual programs center around bilingual materials, faculty recruitment, and program funding. The first problem has generally been addressed, though not satisfactorily resolved, by the program developing its own materials or purchasing Latin-American textbooks and handbooks for students in the vocational courses. The second problem has not been completely resolved. The third problem has been addressed by educating the campus administration and local board members about the need for such programs. Generally, funding for the programs has come from the Vocational Education Act and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA).

To be sure, meeting the postsecondary education needs of the LES/NES community is a complex task. Program goals and objectives differ widely, and most often respond to local needs and capabilities. These efforts, although limited to a few districts, represent an attempt on the part of Community Colleges to adapt to student needs.

The Need for Cooperation in Bilingual Programs

California has a need for additional qualified bilingual teachers at both the K-12 and Community College levels. There is also a need for bilingual programs to meet the needs of the growing number of limited-English speaking persons. There are substantial funds available for these efforts should local school districts and Community College boards wish to utilize them. Unfortunately, there appears to be inadequate collaboration between the institutions responsible for bilingual programs and bilingual teacher training--the State Department of Education, the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing--and the segments of postsecondary education.

However, as a result of the 1977-78 Budget Act, the State Department of Education convened an Interagency Task Force of representatives from the Student Aid Commission, the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, the Community College Chancellor's Office, the California State University and Colleges, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the University of California, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The Task Force was to prepare a report for the fiscal committees of the Assembly and the Senate on the status of bilingual-crosscultural teacher preparation programs in California. A report was completed in November 1978 which included comments on the 1978 study of demand and supply for bilingual-crosscultural teachers by the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing, a proposal for meeting the demand of school districts for bilingual-crosscultural teachers, a schedule for implementing the proposal, and recommendations on the need for uniform examinations or standard criteria for determining the bilingual competence of teachers.

In its report, the Task Force made several recommendations on short-range objectives and commented on long-range objectives, both of which are summarized below. 17/

Short Range Objectives of Task Force

- It is recommended that the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges encourage the establishment of programs oriented to the preparation of bilingual teachers at the Associate in Arts degree level. [The AA degree can lead to a career ladder.]

- It is recommended that continued and increased funding be appropriated for Bilingual Teacher Corps programs (a career ladder program designed to assist bilingual teacher aides to pursue a bilingual teaching credential).

- It is recommended that funding of the Bilingual-Crosscultural Teacher Development Grant (AB 579, 1977) be expanded (to include more students). The Student Aid Commission currently administers a fund of $350,000 to provide 185 grants to students in bilingual programs at 23 different institutions.

- It is recommended that a program be developed to encourage credentialed teachers employed in regular classrooms who are fluent in a second language to become qualified as bilingual teachers.

- It is recommended that the joint participation of institutions of higher education and local school districts prepare plans/programs designed to ameliorate the bilingual teacher shortage be encouraged, e.g., CSUC-LAUSD program described earlier.

- It is recommended that institutions of higher education develop a general bilingual education training program that is designed to be multicultural and multilingual permitting small numbers of teachers to be trained in each of a great many languages in an economically feasible manner.

Long Range Objectives of Task Force

- Clearly, the "solution" to the problem of the bilingual teacher shortage lies in attracting more students with bilingual skills into higher education. Each of the public segments is currently preparing comprehensive student affirmative action plans to effect precisely this. Therefore, we support these plans and urge their funding.

- While its meetings were limited in number, the task force provided an avenue for the exchange of ideas, information and priorities. Such collaboration is a must if bilingual education and teacher training programs are going to be successful in meeting the educational needs of our growing LES/NES population in California.

In response to a request from the Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee, the Task Force submitted a supplemental report with specific plans and funding requirements to implement the recommendations from its November 1978 report. The supplemental report was to discuss the identification of potential pools of teachers who could be trained or retrained to significantly increase the numbers of bilingual/cross-cultural teachers in California.

The supplemental report contained six recommendations with corresponding justifications. Briefly stated, the recommendations call for:

(a) Expansion of the Bilingual Teacher Corps Program;

(b) Expansion of the Bilingual/Cross-cultural Teacher Development Grant Program;

(c) Implementation of a program to assist teachers on waivers to obtain the certificate of competence:

(d) Development of a program to encourage credentialed teachers who are employed in regular classrooms and who are fluent in a second language to become qualified as bilingual teachers;

(e) Award of a one-year planning grant to the California Postsecondary Education Commission to fund an intersegmental committee to plan and develop a statewide cooperative program to train teachers in languages for which there are currently no training programs available; and

(f) Implementation of a program to identify, counsel, and assist Community Colleges to enter bilingual teacher education career ladder programs.

The Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee supported recommendations (a) and (b), and proposed $500,000 for recommendation (c) for Fiscal Year 1979-80. The Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education in the State Department of Education withdrew recommendation (d) and proposed to conduct the study with existing funds. Recommendations (e) and (f) were referred to the State University and the Community Colleges, and were asked to report to the Commission and the Legislature, respectively, by November 1, 1979. 18/

The long-range solution to equal educational opportunity for all California students clearly lies in increasing the college-applicant pool to include more eligible minority students. Cooperative efforts are also essential. However, there is an immediate need at the postsecondary level for the Community Colleges to assume a more active role in establishing teacher training programs at the Associate of Arts level. Also the Community Colleges should assess the need for bilingual programs and services to assist minority-language persons in obtaining a postsecondary education and/or preparing for meaningful employment.

The Department of Education will continue to convene meetings of the Task Force. This initial step is an important one in improving collaboration among the agencies responsible for preparing teachers who can provide effective instruction to limited- and non-English speaking students.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The growth in California's ethnic minority population has been accompanied by an increase in the number of LES/NES students in grades K-12. Projected LES/NES enrollments for Fall 1979 are 328,884.

2. While the preparation of bilingual teachers has increased dramatically over the last four years, there is still a significant gap between the supply of and demand for qualified bilingual teachers. It is estimated that the supply will meet less than 40 percent of the need for bilingual teachers in 1978-79, and less than 60 percent in 1979-80.

3. Recent evidence suggests that there is reason to be optimistic about the effectiveness of bilingual education in responding to the educational needs of LES/NES students.

4. Recent cutbacks in adult education, coupled with the growing numbers of limited-English speaking adults, will require the Community Colleges to play a greater role in the education of such students, who are currently excluded from postsecondary education because of their limited English-language skills.

5. A few Community Colleges have developed bilingual and English as a Second Language programs to prepare LES/NES adults for meaningful employment or transfer to four-year colleges and universities. More Community Colleges, particularly those located in communities with large minority populations, should examine the need for such programs.

6. There is a need to improve coordination among the agencies responsible for the administration of State and federal funds for bilingual education. While the State Department of Educaion's Office of Bilingual/Bicultural Education has administrative responsibility for most of these funds, the Student Aid Commission and the campuses receiving them have some overlapping responsibilities in this area.

FOOTNOTES

1/ *Population Estimates for California Counties: Advance Report*. California Department of Finance, Report 78 E-Z, December 1978.

2/ *Survey of Income and Education*. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, July 1976.

3/ *Quarterly Bulletin*, No. 137. Department of Regional Planning County of Los Angeles, July 1978.

4/ *Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students and Staff in California Public Schools, Fall 1977*. California State Department of Education, October 1978.

5/ Data collected from AB 1329, Fall 1977 Census Mandate. Management Information Center, State Department of Education, 1978.

6/ *Report on the Supply and Demand for Bilingual Teachers in School Districts in California*. Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, September 1978.

7/ *Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1976*. U.S. Bureau of the Census, November 1976.

8/ *Language Usage in the United States: July 1975*. U.S. Bureau of the Census, July 1976.

9/ *The Unfinished Education: Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States*. Mexican American Educational Series, Report II, United States Commission on Civil Rights, October 1971.

10/ See: Snepp, Daniel W., "Why They Drop Out?: 8 Clues to Greater Holding Power." Clearing House 27:492-94, April 1953.

Young, Joe H., "Lost, Strayed or Stolen." Clearing House 29:88-92, October 1954.

Snepp, Daniel W., "Can We Salvage the Dropouts?" Clearing House 31:49-54, September 1956.

Pentry, Ruth C., "Reading Ability and High School Dropouts." Summary, Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Clearing House 23:11-15, October 1959.

11/ *Education for Limited English Speaking and Non-English Speaking Students, Part I*. State Department of Education, April 1978.

12/ See Cruz, Roberto and Zappert, Larraine, *Bilingual Education: An Appraisal of Empirical Research*. February 1978.

Dulay, Heidi, *Why Bilingual Education? A Summary of Research Findings*. San Francisco, Bloomsbury West, Inc., 1978.

Dulay, H. and Burt, M., "Learning and Teaching Research in Bilingual Education." Paper commissioned by Office of the Director, DHEW/National Institute of Education, August 1977.

Dulay, H. and Burt, M., "Bilingual Education: A Close Look at its Effects." Forum, Journal of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, February 1979.

13/ See Cervantes, 1978; O'Mally, 1978; Gray, 1978; Chess and Associates, 1978.

14/ *Report on the Supply and Demand for Bilingual Teachers in School Districts in California*, September 1978. Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

15/ *Bilingual Teacher Corps Program 1977-78*. California State Department of Education, Sacramento 1979.

16/ *The Case for California Public Adult Schools*, Pro-Active Committee on Public School Adult Education, January 1979.

17/ *Report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Fiscal Committees of Each House As Recommended in the Supplemental Language of the Conference Committee on the 1978 Budget Act, Item 295-7, Regarding Bilingual-Crosscultural Education Teachers Needed to Serve the Needs of LES/NES Students*, State Department of Education, November 1978.

18/ The supplemental budget language was revised later to read:

> The California State University and Colleges shall develop a plan for an interinstitutional cooperative teacher training program with special summer miltilingual institutes for the preparation of teachers of languages for which there are currently no training or assessment programs. This plan shall be presented to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) by December 1, 1979. CPEC shall review the report and submit its findings to the legislative fiscal committees by March 1, 1980.

CHAPTER VIII

PROGRAMS TO MEET THE NEEDS OF STUDENTS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

The availability of child care services can be the deciding factor in whether students with dependent children enter, re-enter, or continue postsecondary education. Those in greatest need of such services tend to be low-income, ethnic minority, and women students. The lack of adequate, low-cost campus child care services has been identified as a barrier to equal educational opportunity for these students in many reports of state and national scope. 1/ This chapter: (1) summarizes existing laws and funding sources for child development programs, (2) describes existing campus programs and child care needs in each of the public segments, and (3) identifies policy issues which need to be resolved.

The terms, "child care" and "child development," are used interchangeably throughout this chapter; however, their definitions are distinct. Child care generally refers to basic supervision and custodial care while parents are at work or in training for employment. Child development provides for an educational component, health services, nutrition, staff development and related social services, in addition to basic child care. The term "child care," as it is used in this chapter, will refer to the general caring for children, since the programs described here offer similar developmental services.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Although relatively brief, the legislative history of campus-based child development programs in California is complex, primarily due to a jurisdictional conflict between the Department of Education and the former Department of Social Welfare, now the Department of Social Services. Considerable conflict has resulted from attempts by both agencies to monopolize administrative responsibilities for all State child development programs, and from the lack of clarity in legislation passed to improve the situation.

Child development programs in California were initially funded on a three-to-one (federal:local) matching basis. The Department of Social Welfare assumed the responsibility for determining eligibility guidelines and allocating federal (Title IV-A) funds to local child development programs. Increasingly, however, the Department of Education came to assume the task of administering these programs. In order to clarify the role of each agency, the Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 750 (Chapter 1619, Statutes of 1970), which provided the Department of Education with responsibility for:

1. overall administration of child development programs in cooperation with the Department of Social Welfare;
2. establishment of a uniform, sliding-fee scale for those parents with financial ability to pay;
3. establishment and enforcement of minimum educational standards;
4. establishment of contractual agreements with local or private agencies; and
5. transmittal of funds paid by the Department of Social Welfare to local/private agencies.

While one of the primary purposes of the legislation was to clarify the responsibilities of each agency, AB 750 still allowed the Department of Social Welfare to reimburse the Department of Education for each child eligible to participate in programs funded by State and federal monies.

The following year, the Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 734 (Chapter 1767, Statutes of 1971), which marked the first State legislation directly dealing with campus-based child development programs. Under AB 734, the three public segments of postsecondary education were allowed to "establish and maintain" child development centers on or near each campus. This legislation made it possible for individual campuses to contract with the Department of Education for the 75-percent-federal matching funds. It further stipulated that the remaining 25 percent be matched locally by student fees, other student resources, and/or private funds. A second major accomplishment of AB 734 was the recognition that parents with infants (children under two-years of age) were also eligible for child development services.

Despite the critical role AB 734 played in the establishment of campus-based child development programs, it did little to lessen the conflict between the Department of Education and the Department of Social Welfare.

The next major child development legislation was passed the following year. Assembly Bill 99 (Chapter 670, Statutes of 1972), also known as the Child Development Act of 1972, designated the Department of Education as the sole agency responsible for the "promotion, development and provision" of child development programs in California. The bill further stipulated that the Department was the sole agency designated to "support the State's claim for federal reimbursements." Since 1972, the Department has assumed most of the responsibilities outlined in AB 99. One remaining obstacle, however, is the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) policy which dictates that federal funds are not to be granted directly to state departments of education. Pursuant to AB 99, the Department of Education has requested that HEW issue a waiver for federal funds to be channeled directly to the Department rather than through the Department of Social Services. Sources from the Department of Education report that this waiver has yet to materialize. Superintendent Wilson Riles' Commission to Formulate a State Plan on Child Care and Development has strongly recommended that the waiver continue to be sought. 2/

Prior to 1973, federal guidelines permitted both two- and four-year educational institutions to be considered as "training programs" leading to potential employment. They were thus eligible to receive federal child development reimbursements. In November 1973, new guidelines were published which declared educational agencies eligible only if they offered training programs leading to "immediate employment." Consequently, student parents attending public four-year institutions were ineligible to receive federal assistance while participating in child development programs.

In order to compensate for the loss of federal funds, the Legislature passed an emergency statute in 1973, Assembly Bill 1244, appropriating $605,000 for the support of campus-based child development programs. The Legislature's first financial commitment to such programs therefore came in response to changes in the federal regulations which would eliminate federal assistance. Both the Governor and the Legislature responded and agreed to fund campus programs through 1974-75 at 1972-73 levels. For the 1975-76 fiscal year, the Governor and the Legislature increased the child development program budget by 8 percent to account for inflation.

Despite the State's increasing financial support of child development programs, by 1976 the Department of Education reported that fifty campus-based applications for State and/or federal funding were considered "pending" due to a lack of available funds. In responding to this situation, Assemblyman John Vasconcellos authored two bills designed to help reduce the backlog. After an initial $3 million appropriation was reduced in committee, Assembly Bill 229 (Chapter 1012, Statutes of 1975) increased State support for child development programs by $200,000 for the 1974-75 and 1975-76 fiscal years. Assembly Bill 229 called for the funds to be appropriated to public and private nonprofit segments of postsecondary education in proportion to the student-parent enrollment of each segment, as compared to the total student enrollment of all segments. Mr. Vasconcellos carried a similar bill, Assembly Bill 3790 (Chapter 986, Statutes of 1976) in the 1976 legislative session. While the bill's original language once again called for an appropriation of $3 million, the Legislature agreed to support campus child development programs at a level of $500,000 for the 1976-77 fiscal year.

In July 1976, the Alternative Child Care Program was established with the passage of Assembly Bill 3059 (Chapter 344 of the Statutes of 1976). The intent of this legislation was to: (1) develop and test potentially lower-cost child care alternatives, (2) provide a broad range of publicly subsidized child care services to parents in need of them, (3) address unmet needs in certain regions of the State, and (4) identify workable, alternative child-care practices. This program is described in further detail later in this chapter.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA

As part of the discussion of campus child development programs, it is necessary to review other programs which are currently available. There are several reasons for including a discussion of off-campus (community) resources. First, students eligible for financial aid can use that aid for child development services provided in the community. Second, while campus child development programs are intended primarily for student parents, they serve a relatively small portion of that group. Finally, campus programs account for only 5 percent of the total number of children enrolled in publicly subsidized programs, and only 2.6 percent of the funding for such programs during 1977-78. 3/

The Department of Education administers six different types of child development programs for which low-income, ethnic minority, and women students can and do qualify. These publicly subsidized programs fall under one of the following categories:

- General Child Development programs receive State and/or federal support to meet the needs of children from infancy through age fourteen by providing health, nutrition, and developmental services, thereby freeing parents to work or receive employment training. The eligibility criterion for these services is based on the median income in California. Parents whose income is more than 53 percent of the median income pay a part of the actual hourly cost of care. Once enrolled, children can remain in the program until their parent's income reaches 115 percent of the median income. At that point, the family must pay the full cost of child care. Recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Work Incentive Program (WIN), Supplemental Security Income/State Supplemental Payment (SSI/SSP), or Protective Service Referrals (children under protective custody from possible neglect or abuse), are eligible for subsidized child care at no charge. General child care programs are supported by a combination of federal Title XX funds and State funds.

- Campus Child Development programs primarily serve children of students attending public and independent colleges and universities. The eligibility criteria for campus child care are the same that apply to Title XX and State-funded child development programs which are not campus based. The principal differences are in the clientele and staff composition. The campus centers frequently utilize students in a laboratory-training setting. Prior to 1979-80, funding for campus programs was 75 percent State funding and 25 percent local funds. The local matching requirement, however, was changed to 12.5 percent in the 1979 Budget Act (Item 328).

- School Age Parenting is a program established by the Legislature in 1974 to allow high school students who are parents, or who are pregnant, to complete high school by providing infant care in facilities on or near school campuses. The program provides parent education for young parents as well as infant care. This program is supported entirely by State funds.

- Migrant Child Development programs serve children of migrant farmworkers. The eligibility criteria for the migrant programs are the same as those for Title XX and the State-funded child development programs. The differences in the programs are the clientele and seasonal operating schedules. Support for this program comes largely from State funds, with additional support from the U.S. Department of Labor and ESEA Title I.

- Alternative Child Care programs were established in 1976 by Assembly Bill 3059 (Chapter 344, Statutes of 1976) to provide a broad range of choices to parents needing subsidized child care and to identify low-cost child care programs that could serve as models to be replicated in other parts of the State.

- County Welfare Contracts between the State Department of Education and county welfare departments are the sixth form of child care administered by the Department. County welfare departments can use the funds to provide child care vouchers for parents who are either employed or in mandated training programs. The support for the county welfare contracts is provided from Title XX funds.

FUNDING CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA

During the 1977-78 fiscal year, State and federal expenditures for child development programs in California amounted to $118,322,615. 4/ In addition, the Office of Child Development reports another $58,434,950 in income from local funds and parental fees. 5/ Table VIII-1 provides a breakdown by funding source.

TABLE VIII-1

SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS 1977-1978

Income Source	Level of Funding	% of Total
State	$ 86,126,074	48.7%
Federal	32,196,541	18.2
Local Funds*	52,122,556	29.5
Parents' Fees	6,312,394	3.6
Total	$176,757,565	100.0%

---

*District taxes comprise over 83 percent of the local funds. The remainder of the funds are from college or university contributions, county maintenance of effort, private grants and donations, income from fund raising efforts and any other local sources of revenue.

The Office of Child Development reports that the funds for child development programs during 1977-78 were distributed among the different programs as follows:

TABLE VIII-2

DISTRIBUTION OF SUPPORT FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS 1977-1978

Type of Program	% of Funding
General Child Development	82.6%
Alternative Child Care	9.9
Campus Child Development	2.6
County Welfare	2.4
Migrant Child Development	1.8
School Age Parenting	0.7
	100.0%

Table VIII-3 indicates the total number of children and average daily enrollments in child development programs during 1977-78, and those estimated for 1978-79.

TABLE VIII-3

CHILD DEVELOPMENT ENROLLMENTS BY PROGRAM

	1977-78 (Actual)		1978-79 (Estimated)	
	Total Children	Total Average Daily Enrollment	Total Children	Total Average Daily Enrollment
General Child Development*	100,217	35,790	117,946	42,123
Campus Child Development	5,398	1,927	7,205	2,573
School Age Parenting	976	--	2,039	--
Migrant Child Development	2,924	1,271	3,812	1,657
Alternative Child Care*	20,860	7,450	27,006	9,674
County Welfare	12,788	--	15,335	--
Totals	143,163	46,438	173,343	56,027

---

*A comparison of the funding and enrollments of child development programs indicates that the Alternative Child Care program receives 9.9 percent of the available funding and serves 14.6 percent of the students served, while General Child Development programs receive 82.6 percent of the funding and serve 70 percent of the students. Part of the explanation for these differences is apparent from the comparison of the hourly cost for each program (see Table VIII-4).

Source: Governor's Budget, 1979-80.

TABLE VIII-4

HOURLY COST OF PROVIDING CHILD CARE BY AGE AND PROGRAM TYPE
1977-1978

Age of Child	General Child Care	Campus Child Care	School Age Parenting	Migrant Child Care	Alternative Child Care	County Welfare	Weighted Average
Infant	$2.05	$2.27	*	*	$1.34	$0.85	$1.62
Over 2 Years	1.65	1.70	*	*	1.12	0.72	1.44
Weighted Average	$1.74	$1.90	*	*	$1.20	$0.78	$1.49

---

*School Age Parenting and Migrant Child Care programs report average daily attendance instead of child hours, thus, it is not possible to report the hourly cost for these two programs.

Source: Publicly Subsidized Child Care Services, 1977-78, Office of Child Development, State Department of Education, 1978.

As the information in Table VIII-4 shows, while child development programs do provide a needed service enabling parents (many of whom are low-income and/or women students) either to work or receive training, these services are costly. Moreover, campus-based services are somewhat more expensive than general child care available in the community.

WHO ARE THE RECIPIENTS?

The Office of Child Development conducted a study during April 1977 to determine who benefited from the services provided at the 2,150 publicly subsidized child care facilities during 1977-78. (Approximately 68 percent of all facilities are located in urban areas, 19 percent in towns, and 13 percent in rural areas.) 6/ The survey found that:

- Of the 69,505 children enrolled, 68 percent were in general child development programs; 11 percent in alternative child care programs; 6 percent in county welfare contract programs; 5 percent in campus-based child development programs; 3 percent in migrant programs; 1 percent in school-age parenting programs; and another 6 percent in vendor-payment programs.
- Although almost 70,000 children were enrolled in programs, over 62,000 were on waiting lists.
- Of the children enrolled, 47 percent were between two- and four-years old, 46 percent were five and older, and 7 percent were infants.

- Approximately 35 percent of those parents surveyed reported their ethnicity as white; 34 percent, Black; 25 percent, Chicano; 4 percent, Asian or Pacific Islander; 1 percent, American Indian or Alaskan Native; and 1 percent, Filipino.

- Both campus child development and county welfare contract programs reported larger percentages of white children served, with 62 percent in the former and 50 percent in the latter program.

- Approximately 54 percent of the children were enrolled full time in the programs.

- Of the parents whose children were enrolled, 8 percent were paying the full cost, 53 percent were eligible to pay less than full cost because their gross monthly income was less than 84 percent of the State's median income, and 39 percent received AFDC, SSI/SSP, or WIN support.

- While 75 percent of the families were headed by a single female parent, 2 percent were headed by a single male parent; 23 percent were two-parent families.

- While 77 percent of the full-cost families were two-parent families, 68 percent of the income-eligible families were headed by a single female parent and 93 percent of those receiving AFDC, SSI/SSP, or WIN were also headed by a single female parent.

- While 68 percent of the parents needing child care were employed, 21 percent were unemployed, student parents, or disabled, and 11 percent were in training.

The survey indicated, as noted earlier, that campus-based child development programs serve a relatively small percentage of the families who need child care services. More importantly, the data indicate that over 92 percent of the beneficiaries of publicly subsidized child development programs are low-income parents of all ethnic backgrounds, while 75 percent are single women heads-of-household. It appears that existing child development programs are meeting, at most, only one-half of the need, based on the number of children on waiting lists. The number of children on waiting lists, however, is, at best, a conservative estimate of unmet need.

In 1978, approximately 1,372,000 children of working mothers in California were too young to care for themselves. Approximately 372,000 did not need care because someone was available to care for them. However, there were approximately 129,000 subsidized spaces and 169,000 other licensed spaces in child care programs. 7/ This indicates that, out of one million children of working mothers, only 40 percent can presently be served by child care program.

If current trends continue, the number of children of working mothers will continue to increase over the next five years, despite the decline in the birthrate. The increasing numbers of working mothers, mothers who work when their children are younger, and divorces and separations, will account for the increasing need for child care. It is estimated that the number of children in California under fourteen whose mothers work will increase from 2,240,000 in 1978 to 2,455,000 in 1984--an increase of 215,000. 8/ National statistics show that, by 1984, among the children under six years of age, 52.4 percent will have mothers who work, compared to 40.4 percent in 1978. 9/ National projections also indicate that, by 1984, 24 percent of the children through fourteen years will be members of a one-parent family, compared to 17.1 percent in 1978 and 11.1 percent in 1970. 10/

CAMPUS CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The California Community Colleges

On April 28, 1978, the Board of Governors adopted the following statement regarding Community College child development programs:

> Recognizing that large numbers of potential community college students are prevented from matriculating in community colleges because they are unable to obtain adequate child care services, and recognizing that it is in the state and national interest for those persons who need such services and who can profit from community college instruction to receive this type of assistance, the Board of Governors shall make every effort to obtain state and federal funding for adequate child care centers for the use of community college students. The colleges shall be required to exhaust all possible on-campus facilities before state funds for child care centers shall be approved by the Chancellor's Office. 11/

The most recent data available on the status of Community College child care/child development programs comes from a study conducted during 1977-78. 12/ The results of the study indicate the following:

- While 5,803 children were enrolled in Community College child development programs, over 80 percent of the programs had waiting lists, with a combined total of over 3,000 children.

- The majority of children being served by the Community Colleges are from two-parent families (52.3%), 46.7 percent are from single-parent families where the mother is the head of the household, and 1 percent are from single-parent families where the father is the head of the household.

- Approximately 24 percent of the Community College student population have dependent children, yet only 2 percent were served by campus-based child development programs.

- Of the families who have made use of the child development services, 50 percent have annual incomes below $12,000, 25 percent between $3,000 and $6,000, and 12 percent below $3,000.

- Approximately 65 percent of those surveyed reported their ethnicity as white; 14 percent, Chicano; 13 percent, Black; 4 percent, Asian or Pacific Islander; 1 percent, American Indian; 1 percent, Filipino; and 2 percent, Other (includes nonrespondents).

- Eighty Community Colleges provide child development programs or services, but only forty-four (55%) receive subsidies from the State Department of Education.

- During the previous year (1976-77), local funds constituted 74 percent of the total budget for Community College child development programs, State and federal contributions provided 18 percent, and parental fees made up the remaining 8 percent.

The Board of Governors has expressed a commitment to providing opportunities to re-entry women. The addition and expansion of child development programs during the past seven years (77 percent of the existing eighty centers have become operational within the last seven years) attests to that commitment. However, since district taxes and permissive tax overrides represented the largest single source of funding, more Community Colleges are expected to seek funds from the State and federal governments. The Community Colleges are expecting to rely more heavily on parental fees.

The Community College programs will receive some relief during 1979-80 as a result of the 1979 Budget Act, Item 328, which established a 12.5 percent local matching requirement for the receipt of campus child care funds. (Previously the campus child care programs were required to provide a 25 percent local match to qualify for State funds.) However, it is not yet known what kind of support these programs will have beyond 1979-80.

The California State University and Colleges

The State University has provided child development services since the late 1960s (several years before the State Legislature provided funding for campus-based programs). As of September 1977, child care was available on all nineteen State University campuses. As in the case of the Community Colleges, the most recent available data on child development programs is from a survey conducted by the Child Care Study Committee during the 1977-78 academic year.

The Child Care Study Committee was established by the State University Chancellor at the request of the Student Presidents' Association and the Academic Senate. The Committee was asked to: (1) assess current child care needs; (2) review State, Trustee, and Chancellor's Office policies on child care; and (3) review current and alternative funding mechanisms.

Some of the survey's major findings are summarized below: 13/

- In order to receive State funds, campus-based child care programs must provide 25 percent in matching funds, the only child care programs required to match State funds. [Author's note: the requirement was changed to 12.5 percent in the 1979 Budget Act.]

- There is no systemwide policy governing the establishment and operation of campus-based child care programs.

- While the use of State funds for child care programs is not legally prohibited, Chancellor's Office policy currently prohibits the expenditure of these funds for child care because there has been no specific legislative appropriation for such services.

- State University child care programs served 1,604 children between the ages of three months to fourteen years in each term during the 1977-78 academic year. This number represents 5.3 percent of those State University students that indicated a need for child care.

- While the largest percentage of parents served by campus-based child care programs are students (86.9%), 8.6 percent are from the local community, 3.0 percent are faculty members, and 1.4 percent are staff.

- Of the students served, 25 percent are single parents, nearly all of whom are women.

- Approximately 74 percent of those surveyed were white; 12 percent, Black; 6 percent, Chicano; 4 percent, Asian; 1 percent, American Indian; and 3 percent, Other (includes nonrespondents).

- Total income for the State University child care programs was $1,155,243. Of that amount, 29 percent was from the Department of Education's campus child development program, 27 percent from parental fees, 25 percent from the Associated Students, 6 percent from CETA funds, 5 percent from in-kind sources, 2 percent from the State Food Program, and the remainder from fund raising, cash contributions, capital outlay, revenue sharing, and temporary help.

- A survey conducted by the State University in Fall 1977 indicated that Black and Chicano respondents expressed a significantly higher need for child care, as compared to other ethnic groups. Of the students who indicated a need for child care, 63 percent were female, 37 percent were male. Of that group, 54 percent had children under two years of age.

The Child Care Study Committee made the following recommendations:

- The Chancellor's Office should seek elimination of the provision requiring 25 percent matching funds to be eligible to receive State child care funds. [Author's note: The Chancellor's Office has sought the elimination of this provision. As stated earlier, the local matching requirement was reduced to 12.5 percent for 1979-80.]

- Comprehensive policy guidelines on the establishment and operation of campus-based child care programs should be developed for and implemented by State University campuses.

- The policy of the Chancellor's Office prohibiting use of State funds for child care programs should be modified to allow campuses wishing to expend such funds to do so under procedures established by the Chancellor.

- A Program Change Proposal (PCP) should be developed to provide a classification and funding for the position of Child Care Center Director.

- Campus efforts should be continued to encourage the use of campus child care programs by ethnic minorities, with special attention given to underrepresented groups.

It is expected that each of these recommendations will be acted upon. In response to the fourth recommendation, the Board of Trustees expressed its support for child development programs by adopting the following resolution in October 1978:

> . . . RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges that the Support Budget of the California State University and Colleges for 1979-80 be approved as submitted by the Chancellor with the addition of $405,134 for Child Care Centers . . . 14/

Unfortunately, the $405,134 request was deleted in the 1979-80 Governor's Budget.

Currently the State University Chancellor's Office has developed a policy statement which incorporates the other four recommendations. After the campus presidents have an opportunity to respond, the statement may become official policy. Even though the local matching requirement has been reduced to 12.5 percent for 1979-80, funding for campus child care programs remains a real concern for the California State University and Colleges.

University of California

The University's child care programs differ substantially from those of the other two public segments in terms of funding and program administration. Funding for the program depends largely on campus and Chancellor support. Each Chancellor has operational responsibility for the campus child care program. As funding becomes scarcer, the competition for funds increases. The Registration Fee is the largest single source of income for child development programs and they must compete with all other student services for funding.

The University conducted a survey of campus-based child development programs during 1978-79. 15/ The major findings of the survey were:

- All nine University campuses offer some kind of child development program.
- Seven of the nine campuses receive support from the campus child development program administered by the Department of Education.
- A total of 678 children were served by the University's child development programs.
- All campuses maintain a waiting list of applicants, which ranges from 3 children at Santa Barbara to 350 at Los Angeles.

191

- Total income for child development programs was $1,498,775 in 1977-78. Major sources were: 41 percent from the University Registration Fee; 23 percent from campus-based child development programs; and 21 percent from parental fees. During 1978-79, the income was approximately $1,704,474, with the largest portions from the same sources. However, while program funding increased by 8 percent, income from the University Registration Fee decreased by 5 percent, and funding from the President's Office dropped from 4 percent of the total budget in 1977-78 to 1.4 percent in 1978-79.

- On four University campuses, priority for admission to the child care program is given to student parents; Santa Cruz gives first priority to low-income families; Davis bases priority on the age of the child; San Francisco bases priority on ability to pay; Irvine admits children on a first-come, first-served basis; and Los Angeles gives equal weight to all of these factors.

- While 85 percent of the parents served were students, the University's programs also provided services to parents from the community, 11 percent; staff, 3.5 percent; and faculty, .3 percent.

A growing problem of particular significance to student parents attending the University and the State University is the lack of available child care services for graduate and professional-school students. As previously noted, student parents attending public four-year institutions were deemed ineligible to receive federal assistance while participating in child development programs because a baccalaureate program was not recognized as one leading to "immediate employment." A few years later, however, the federal guidelines were again changed to provide support for working parents and for student parents pursuing a baccalaureate degree. To date, however, graduate and professional-school students cannot avail themselves of publicly subsidized child development services because the federal guidelines do not recognize graduate and professional programs as "leading to immediate employment." The only exceptions to that regulation are campus child development centers. Thus, while undergraduate student parents can be served by any publicly subsidized child development program, graduate and professional-school students are limited to campus child development programs. This regulation is expected to have an adverse effect on the growing number of women, minority, and low-income students interested in obtaining graduate and professional training.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data available on child care programs:

1. The need for child care services to enable parents to enter, re-enter, or continue postsecondary education is especially pronounced for women, minority, and low-income students.

2. While campus surveys and waiting lists are not the most accurate indicators of unmet need, they are the only source currently available. The following evidence suggests that women, minority, and low-income students may have a serious unmet need for child care--as campus-based programs are the only ones where students have priority. The 1,604 children served by State University programs represent only 5.3 percent of student parents expressing a need for campus child care. The University's nine campus programs combined served 678 children--and one campus alone (Los Angeles) maintains a waiting list of 350. And while 24 percent of the Community College students have dependent children, only 2 percent were able to be served by campus programs.

3. The need for campus child care extends to graduate and professional-school students, who are unable to receive publicly subsidized child care services, except for campus child care. Federal regulations do not recognize education beyond the baccalaureate degree as "leading to immediate employment."

4. State and local support for campus child development programs has been unstable from its inception. State funding has been subject to legislative support and approval, while local funding has been subject to campus priorities, administration approval, tax overrides, and the like.

5. Campus-based centers in the public four-year segments are the only child development programs required to provide 12.5 percent in matching funds to qualify for State funding. In effect, they can receive only 87.5 percent the amount available to other State-supported child development programs. With the passage of Proposition 13 many programs have lost local matching funds.

6. Several questions must be considered seriously by each of the public segments: What is the extent of unmet need for child care? What is the most equitable and economical way to serve the largest number of student parents? To whom will priority for child care services be given in a period of no growth? Should parental fees be raised and to what extent?

FOOTNOTES

1/ See: *Student Affirmative Action Plan for the California Community Colleges*, February 1979; *A Framework for Student Affirmative Action in the California State University and Colleges*, December 1978; *Women in Academic: Steps to Greater Equality*, Judith Gappa and Barbara Uehling, AAHE-ERIC, Research Report No. 2, 1979; *Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education*, Esther Manning Westervelt. NCES 75-407. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975. ED 111 256.

2/ *Child Care and Development Services*, Report of the Commission to Formulate a State Plan for Child Care and Development Services in California, 1978.

3/ *Annual Report On Publicly Subsidized Child Care Services*, 1977-78, Office of Child Development, State Department of Education, 1978.

4/ *Governor's Budget*, 1979-80.

5/ *Op. Cit.*, p. 81.

6/ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

7/ *Child Care and Development Services*, p. 5.

8/ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

9/ *Children of Working Mothers, 1978*, Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1978.

10/ *Op. Cit.*, p. 5.

11/ *California Community Colleges' Board of Governors Agenda*, June 1978, p. 10.

12/ *Child Development Instructional Programs and Services*, Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, April 1978.

13/ *Report of the Child Care Study Committee*, Office of the Chancellor, California State University and Colleges, September 1978.

14/ *California State University and Colleges' Board of Trustees Agenda*, October 1978.

15/ *University of California Child Care Survey*, 1978-79.

CHAPTER IX

AN ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING PROGRAMS TO MEET THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS

This report has concentrated on four specific ethnic minority groups: Chicano, Black, Asian, and American Indian. Because of the relative size of these groups, most of the emphasis in student affirmative programs has been in response to the educational needs of students who are Chicano or Black. However, the Commission's second report on equal educational opportunity acknowledged that American Indians are faced with special educational problems and needs which should be addressed in any statewide planning for student affirmative action. Accordingly, this chapter: (1) identifies the special educational problems faced by American Indian students; (2) identifies the existing programs and resources specifically developed to respond to these problems; and (3) presents recommendations for programs or actions to expand postsecondary educational opportunities for American Indians.

BACKGROUND

One of the major problems with any data concerning American Indians, including enrollments in postsecondary institutions, is the lack of agreement on the definition of the term, "American Indian." To qualify for the benefits administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), a person must show proof through certification and heritage that he or she possesses one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood. The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) has a broader definition, which states:

> "Indian" means any individual living on or off a reservation who (a) is a member of a tribe, band or other organized group of Indians, including those tribes, bands, or groups terminated since 1940 and those recognized now or in the future by the State in which they reside, or who is a descendant, in the first or second degree, of any such member, or (b) is considered by the Secretary of the Interior to be an Indian for any purpose, or (c) is an Eskimo or Aleut or other Alaska Native.

A third definition is the one developed by each reservation through its Tribal Council, which has the authority to establish its own blood-degree requirement. A Tribal Council may, for example, specify one-eighth or one-sixteenth degree of Indian blood, and any person meeting this requirement may be enrolled with that tribe. A fourth definition, used in the United States Census reports as well as by postsecondary institutions, designates an American Indian as any person claiming Indian heritage. The lack of a commonly accepted definition has resulted in considerable disagreement about the number of American Indians enrolled in public schools and postsecondary institutions, as well as the overall number living in California.

Based on the HEW definition, there were 256,195 American Indians in California in 1977. Within the State there are currently seventy-six Indian reservations and rancherias. The counties with the largest Indian populations are, in descending order: Los Angeles, Sacramento, Orange, Contra Costa, and Tulare. Table IX-1 presents data concerning high school drop-out rates, average grade completion, total population, and school population for American Indians in California from 1972 through 1977. In considering these data, the following points should be noted:

- The number of students reported as American Indian in the public schools should be considered an estimate, and is not comparable from year to year. During the past three years there has been an improvement in the reporting of American Indians in California; also a large number of American Indians have migrated into California during the same period.

- The reduction in high school drop-out rates represents a significant trend. However, it should be noted that the 1972 data utilize the BIA definition of an American Indian, while the subsequent years utilize the HEW definition. The Department of Education expects the drop-out rate to level off at 35 percent in urban areas and 20 percent in rural areas. 1/

- The reasons presented for students dropping out differ between the urban and rural areas. The two major reasons in urban areas are: "It [school] doesn't meet my needs," and "I'd rather be with the gang." In the rural areas, the reasons are: "It [school] doesn't meet my needs," and "I have to help support the family." 2/

The educational needs of American Indians are not met adequately by the public schools in California. One of the major causes of the high drop-out rate is the heavy concentration of American Indian students in the poorer school districts--central city/urban districts and rural districts. According to a national survey of compensatory education completed in 1970, 35 percent of all American Indian students are in school districts with a per pupil expenditure below $425, while 40 percent are in districts with expenditures of $425 to $624 per pupil. 3/ Generally, teachers of American Indian students are not specifically qualified to teach them, nor are there many American Indians among these teachers. To illustrate, 62 percent of these teachers in 1970 had no training in the teaching of

TABLE IX-1
AMERICAN INDIAN STATISTICS
BASED ON HEW DEFINITION

Drop Out Rate

	1972	1975	1976	1977
Urban	77.2	61.4	55.7	42.6
Rural	55.7	49.4	37.5	28.6

Average Grade Completion

	1972	1975	1976	1977
Urban	5.5	8.0	9.1	10.0
Rural	6.7	8.7	9.3	11.1

Population Total

1972	1975	1976	1977
92,000	196,751	239,435	256,195

School Population

	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977
Pre-K	-	-	-	1,000	1,444	2,022
K-3	-	-	-	8,650	14,597	15,680
4-6	-	-	-	7,179	12,114	13,013
7-12	-	-	-	14,515	24,494	26,307
TOTAL:	*21,476	15,417	18,250	31,344	52,639	57,022

---

* Bureau of Indian Affairs Definition

Source: State Department of Education
American Indian Education Unit

the academically disadvantaged. Nationally, in 1970, the ethnic background of teachers of American Indians included 14 percent Black, 78 percent white, and 8 percent Indian, Asian, or Spanish-surname. 4/

In addition to major problems in education, American Indians have severe health problems. Generally, the health level of the national American Indian population lags twenty to twenty-five years behind that of the general population. The following provide examples of this problem:

- The infant mortality rate for American Indians is twice the national average.
- The incidence of hepatitis among American Indians is fifteen times greater than that of the general population.
- The incidence of tuberculosis among American Indians is eight times greater than that of the general population.

Also, special health problems exist among American Indians, particularly otitis media (middle-ear disease); trachoma (an eye disease); and alcoholism.

Given the situation in education and health, the overall economic condition of American Indians is poor. Particularly significant aspects of the adult Indian profile include: 5/

- The average life expectancy is approximately forty-five years.
- Among heads of households, one-third are totally unskilled (1970 Survey of Compensatory Education).
- Only approximately 1 percent of heads of households are technically skilled or professional (1970 Survey of Compensatory Education).
- Among Indian heads of households:
  - (a) 37 percent have completed less than grade school;
  - (b) 58 percent have completed less than high school;
  - (c) 14 percent have completed high school;
  - (d) 2 percent have completed four-year degree programs; and

(e) 1 percent have completed a graduate program.

- The illiteracy rate among the Navajos, the largest tribe, is 90 percent.

California has the third-largest American Indian population of the fifty states. The education, health, and economic problems experienced by American Indians nationally are also characteristic of those living in California. There is clearly a need to improve the educational opportunities available to this group of California citizens.

EXISTING PROGRAMS RESPONDING TO THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF AMERICAN INDIANS

There are four major federal programs which could be used to provide financial assistance to expand educational opportunities for American Indian students. They are: the Johnson-O'Malley Act, Impact Aid, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and the Indian Education Act of 1972.

Johnson-O'Malley Act: The Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 (JOM) provides funds to be used by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the education of American Indian children in public schools. Federal Regulations state that the Bureau shall administer the JOM program

> . . . to accommodate unmet financial needs of school districts related to the presence of large blocks of nontaxable Indian-owned property in the district and relatively large numbers of Indian children. . . which local funds are inadequate to meet.

A major purpose of the Act was to provide a means for enrolling an increasing number of American Indian children in public schools, thereby supplying educational services to that group through the same facilities used by others. The funding in this program is specifically directed toward people with one-fourth or more degree of American Indian blood.

Impact Aid: Two Impact Aid laws--Public Law 874 and Public Law 815--provide funds to compensate public school districts for the loss of part of their tax base when federal installations are established in the district. These two laws, passed in 1950, were primarily the result of expanded military and defense activities of the federal government. However, since American Indian reservations are considered federal land, some school districts became eligible for funding for school construction (Public Law 815) and general operating expenses (Public Law 874).

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: As discussed in Chapter IV, this Act sought to address the special needs of economically and educationally disadvantaged school children. Title I provides financial assistance to local school districts which offer supplemental educational services to students whose parental income is below the poverty level. Since many American Indian families have low incomes, Title I funds can be used to respond to educational needs of their children. The U.S. Office of Education administers Title I funds, making allocations directly to the California State Board of Education. In turn, the Department of Education awards funds to local districts for programs for educationally disadvantaged children.

The Indian Education Act of 1972: Title IV of the Education Amendments of 1972, also known as the Indian Education Act of 1972, provides federal assistance directly to local school districts and to tribal educational institutions to meet the educational needs of American Indian children and adults, as well as to train teachers for American Indian education. Title IV funds are to be used for different types of projects: (1) "planning and developing new educational programs to meet Indian students' special needs," and (2) "establishing and maintaining permanent programs for Indian education, including the acquisition of equipment and facilities." 7/

In California, these four federal programs are supplemented by two State programs: the Native American Indian Education Program, and Indian Education Centers. Legislation adopted in 1974 (Chapter 1425, Statutes of 1974) provided for the establishment of ten Indian Education Centers designed to improve (1) the academic achievement of American Indian students, particularly in reading and mathematics, and (2) the self-concept of American Indian students and adults. Other important objectives of the Centers are to provide:

- Increased employment of American Indian adults;
- A center for related community activities;
- Tutorial assistance in reading and mathematics;
- Individual and group counseling for students and adults related to personal adjustment, academic progress, and vocational planning;
- Programs in coordination with the public schools;

- A neutral location for parent-teacher conferences;
- A focus for summer recreational program and academic activities;
- Adult classes and activities;
- College-related training programs for prospective American Indian teachers; and
- Libraries and other educational materials.

These Centers are administered by Boards of Directors rather than school districts.

The objectives of the Native American Indian Education Program are similar to those of the Education Centers, except that (1) the program emphasis is on basic skill training for American Indian pupils in kindergarten through grade four and (2) the program is administered by the local school district. In 1978-79, the program served 814 students in 10 districts. State funding for these two programs is summarized in the following table.

TABLE IX-2

EXPENDITURES FOR INDIAN EDUCATION CENTERS

	Actual 1977-78	Estimated 1978-79	Proposed 1979-80
State Operations:			
Special Programs.	$ 66,357	$122,109	$128,041
Department Management . . .	15,723	24,383	26,167
Total, State Operations . .	$ 82,080	$146,492	$154,208
Local Assistance.	$636,000	$606,753	$606,753
TOTAL	$718,080	$753,245	$760,961

EXPENDITURES FOR NATIVE AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAM

	Actual 1977-78	Estimated 1978-79	Proposed 1979-80
State Operations.	---	$ 25,110	$ 27,123
Local Assistance.	$270,000	257,580	257,580
TOTAL.	$270,000	$282,690	$284,703

Source: Analysis of the Budget Bill of the State of California, 1979-80, pp. 910-911.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS FACED BY AMERICAN INDIANS

In order to identify the significant problems which limit opportunities for American Indians to utilize existing postsecondary alternatives in California, Commission staff surveyed American Indian educators at colleges and universities throughout the State. The primary problems identified through this survey were:

- Many low-income American Indian students need more financial aid than they are eligible for under existing guidelines. This increased need is the result of the great distance between the reservation and the college campus, and the cost of travel to visit the family.

- Many financial aid administrators do not understand BIA grants and, consequently, they do not prepare the most effective possible financial aid packages for American Indian students.

- The absence of American Indian faculty and staff limit the number of people with whom students can identify and readily discuss their problems.

- Many American Indian students, particularly those from reservations, have difficulty in making the adjustment from a rural background and way of life to an urban college campus.

- The college campus, and the surrounding community, generally do not offer support for many aspects of the cultural background of the American Indian student. In order to participate in religious ceremonies, the student usually needs to return to the reservation.

- The educational background of American Indian students is frequently weak, particularly in science, mathematics, and writing. The academic programs offered by American Indian boarding schools do not prepare students for college work.

- American Indian students are generally not as aggressive in academic situations as are students from the dominant culture. Their hesitancy to ask questions in the classroom and actively participate in discussions is sometimes perceived by instructors as demonstrating a lack of interest or initiative.

Existing campus-based activities which seem most successful in responding to the problems of American Indian students are (1) American Indian ethnic studies programs, (2) American Indian counselors employed either by the EOP/S program or the campus counseling services, (3) programs in writing and reading competency which assist American Indian Students in developing English language skills, and (4) a support-service component specifically designed for American Indian students. The common characteristic of these activities that seems the most effective in helping American Indians persist in college is that they provide a place on the campus where students can come together for mutual support, with involvement on the part of American Indian faculty and/or staff.

The major program designed to increase the enrollment of American Indians in postsecondary institutions is the University of California's American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association, which was established in April 1977. While the program seeks to "promote all segments of higher education beyond the secondary level, emphasis is placed on the University of California in particular." 8/ The Association works with American Indian Education Centers, Title IV, and JOM programs to increase the information available to American Indian high school students about postsecondary alternatives. Other goals and objectives of the Association are: 9/

- To establish an organization comprised of college counselors and recruiters to increase significantly the number of American Indian students in postsecondary institutions.
- To coordinate outreach efforts to improve services to students in the form of College Motivation Programs and Career Days in key locations which can draw significant numbers of American Indians from junior and senior high schools and Community Colleges.
- To establish, maintain, and improve communication with American Indian, community-based organizations and educational programs for the purpose of informing them of the educational options available to students.
- Identify Community Colleges to which ineligible applicants to four-year institutions can be referred.

The problem for this American Indian recruitment program, and for the four support service activities, is the lack of personnel and funding. On the Santa Barbara campus of the University, for example, one person is responsible for both recruiting and counseling American Indian students. When that person is away from campus on recruiting visits throughout California (from September through mid-December), first-year students have no American Indian counselor to provide assistance. Because American Indians are a relatively small minority group in California, a relatively small amount of the funds for student affirmative action is allocated to expanding their educational opportunities.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be presented concerning the educational needs of American Indian students:

1. Available data do not provide the basis for drawing firm conclusions about the level of representation of American Indians in postsecondary education. The lack of agreement on the definition of an American Indian is the primary cause of this problem. In order to improve the quality of data, postsecondary institutions should require students identifying their ethnicity as American Indian to also identify their tribal affiliation and blood degree.

2. American Indian students generally do not enjoy the same quality of educational opportunity as do white students in either the public schools or postsecondary institutions.

3. While considerable funding has been provided by the federal and State governments to improve educational opportunities for American Indians in elementary and secondary schools, only limited amounts have been provided to improve postsecondary opportunities. The University of California is the only segment to establish and provide funds for a statewide American Indian recruitment program. The California State University and Colleges should develop a similar statewide recruitment program.

4. The American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association is a good model of the structure and process needed to expand American Indian enrollments in postsecondary institutions. This program utilizes State and federally funded programs for American Indian youth as a means to increase their motivation and academic preparation for college. Thus far, however, the program has emphasized only one segment of postsecondary education and has had less than adequate funding. The California State University and Colleges and the California Community Colleges should develop and implement proposals to participate in this program with the University of California.

FOOTNOTES

1/ American Indian statistics based on HEW definition, State Department of Education, American Indian Education Unit, dated March 24, 1977, p. 4.

2/ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

3/ "Fact Sheet on Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut People," completed by the Office of Indian Education, May 1975, (no page numbers).

4/ *Ibid.*

5/ *Ibid.*

6/ 25 C.F.R. 33.4 (6) (1973); as quoted in *The Navajo Nation: An American Colony*, a report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, September 1975, p. 90.

7/ 20 U.S.C. 241 cc (Supp. 1973), as stated in *The Navajo Nation: An American Colony*, p. 103.

8/ "University of California American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association," Proposal for Supplemental Funding for F.Y. 1978-79, submitted June 30, 1978 to UC Systemwide Administration.

9/ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER X

STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS BY THE THREE PUBLIC SEGMENTS OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 requested the three public segments to prepare and implement a plan to address and overcome the underrepresentation of ethnic minority, women, and low-income students in their undergraduate and graduate student bodies. This chapter: (1) describes the status of each segment's planning efforts, (2) summarizes the primary themes and recommendations of each plan, and (3) provides recommendations for future segmental planning efforts.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Undergraduate Plan

The University of California has employed a systematic and thoughtful process in preparing its undergraduate student affirmative action plan. In 1974, in response to both ACR 151 and to internal concern about declining minority enrollments, then President Charles J. Hitch appointed five task forces made up of students, faculty, and staff to "identify any barriers to the increased access or success of women, minorities, and economically or otherwise disadvantaged students, and recommend steps to remove those barriers." These task forces issued a lengthy joint report in July 1975. At about the same time, the President's Task Force on Chicanos and the University issued its final report, with several recommendations presented on steps the University might take to increase Chicano enrollments. 1/ Some of the key recommendations of the two reports were implemented during 1975-76, with financial support from the State and the University Regents. These activities came to be known collectively as the University of California Student Affirmative Action Program. In 1976-77, this systemwide program was expanded with the initiation of a new program at the junior high school level, the enhancement of the University's student support services network, and the beginning of an evaluation project.

In 1977, following the implementation of the expanded program, the University began development of a formal student affirmative action plan. The first phase of the planning process began at the campus level, with the appropriate campus officers asked to develop plans within specific guidelines and to submit the plans to the President's Office during the summer of 1977. Based primarily on campus proposals, a draft plan for the University system was developed during the following months. Most of the work on this plan was done by staff in the President's Office, but initial drafts were reviewed by campus student affirmative action employees. The draft plan was reviewed by the President in November 1977, and presented to the Council of Chancellors at its December meeting. Subsequently, it was sent to the campuses for detailed review. Following this review, the final plan was submitted to the Postsecondary Education Commission in April 1978.

Prior to preparing its plan, the University took several initial steps important to an effective planning process. Each student affirmative action task force provided a thorough "needs analysis" by identifying the several barriers to expanded educational opportunities for ethnic minorities, women, and low-income students. An inventory was made of all student affirmative action programs on the University's campuses, which was published as a supplement to the Student Affirmative Action Plan. The major barriers to expanded educational opportunities at the University were identified through a detailed analysis of the postsecondary activities of high school graduates in 1975. In short, the University staff completed a thorough review of the problems to be addressed, the resources available, and the student needs which required action, prior to developing a plan.

The primary theme of the University's student affirmative action effort is that ethnic minorities and low-income students are underrepresented because they achieve eligibility for admission at a lower rate than white and middle- or high-income students. Evidence to support the accuracy of this assumption was provided in the University report entitled, Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College?, which concluded that "Black and Chicano students achieve UC eligibility at less than one-third the rate of white students," 2/ while "low-income graduates had lower eligibility rates--and thus fewer postsecondary options--than upper-income students." 3/ Therefore, expanded recruiting and providing more information to high school seniors about postsecondary alternatives were not expected to increase University enrollments of Black and Chicano students. Instead, if one accepts "differential achievement rates" as the major cause of underrepresentation, a coordinated effort by postsecondary institutions to influence the educational process at the elementary and secondary levels is required. Consequently, the University's student affirmative action plan is directed toward working closely with junior and senior high schools to raise educational aspirations, improve the quality of instruction, increase student effort, and expand academic and personal support for underrepresented ethnic minority students.

In 1976-77, the University initiated a Partnership Program in approximately 104 junior high schools. The general goal of the program is to motivate ethnic minority students to seek a college education and to prepare for admission to the University. The program's services include counseling; role model presentations by University faculty, staff, and students; multi-media presentations that offer motivational and informational assistance; campus tours; and printed information for students, parents, and school staff. 4/ This program is the central element in the University's student affirmative action plan, which calls for its expansion during the next four years. 5/

In addition, the University initiated several other activities in 1976-77 directly related to student affirmative action:

- American Indian recruiters and counselors formed a new organization to coordinate outreach efforts and to sponsor several College Motivation Programs.
- The University applied for and received a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to finance a study of the educational information needs of low-income and minority students in high schools and Community Colleges.
- Staff from the University's systemwide Student Affirmative Action Office held a series of meetings with the staff from the State Department of Education to exchange information concerning activities in the equal opportunity area and to identify possible areas for cooperation.

The University's Student Affirmative Action Plan built from these on-going activities with a series of action plans for 1977-78 and subsequent years. Among these plans, the following are particularly significant:

> Beginning in July 1977, responsibility for EOP and Student Affirmative Action Programs--as well as traditional outreach services--rests with a single office, the Office of Outreach Services to Schools and Students. This office is headed by a Coordinator who is responsible, through an Assistant Vice President, to the Academic Vice President for supervision of the overall student affirmative action effort. This reorganization should result in improved coordination of services. 6/
>
> Beginning in 1978-79, the University will establish a Presidential Advisory Council on Student Affirmative Action. This Council will include individuals from inside and outside the University and will be charged with advising the President and, through him, the Chancellors on the scope, direction, and quality of University student affirmative action programs. 7/

Beginning in Fall, 1978, the President of the University is taking the initiative in proposing the formation of a national consortium of institutions willing to commit themselves to a comprehensive student affirmative action effort during the next five years. 8/

Beginning in 1977-78, the University will develop a comprehensive media plan for reaching minority and low-income youngsters with information about higher education. The first piece of this plan will consist of several 30-second television spots to be aired in Fall, 1978. 9/

Through the American Indian Counselors/Recruiters Association, the University will sponsor in 1977-78 and 1978-79 a series of College Motivation Days in areas populated by Indian peoples. In addition, special motivational and informational materials and media are being developed specifically for use with this population. 10/

During 1978, the Academic Vice President will arrange a series of student affirmative action discussions with Statewide committees of the Academic Senate. Such meetings will be designed to familiarize faculty members with the various SAA programs, with the changing characteristics of the student population, and with the particular needs of these students. At the same time, each campus will be encouraged to pursue a similar course of action with the local Senate Division. 11/

During the 1977-78 and 1978-79 academic years we want to assess, on a systematic, University-wide basis, our relationships with the Community Colleges with regard to transfer opportunities for minority and low-income students. In addition, we will attempt to further develop and support the University of California/Community College Consortia developed in several areas. These cooperative efforts show great potential to improve the current situation. We will also be taking a critical look at the information provided to Community College students, both when they enter the Community College and when they wish to transfer. By late 1978, we anticipate developing and disseminating more complete information. 12/

The University's Student Affirmative Action Plan also provides a mechanism for assessing the impact of support services on student success and for identifying essential services and the most effective means of delivering them. The first components of this mechanism were put into place in 1977-78, including provisions for

"(1) improvements in campus EOP/SAA data bases, (2) evaluation of the impacts of summer 'bridge' programs, and (3) a University-wide survey of EOP/SAA students (and a control group) who entered the University for the first time in Fall 1977. The survey will collect information on the services used by the students, the extent of service usage, satisfaction with services, and unmet needs." 13/

Beginning in 1978-79, a different set of services are scheduled to be evaluated each year on a rotating basis. These include:

1. Orientation/Summer Bridge
2. Academic Advising
3. Personal Counseling
4. Skills Development
5. Housing
6. Financial Advising
7. Career and Graduation Preparation
8. Program Management/Coordination
9. Tutoring 14/

Graduate Plan

The University established a Graduate Student Affirmative Action Task Force in October 1978. The Task Force is to "identify barriers to the University graduate and professional programs and make recommendations for systemwide, campus, and departmental activities, for both administrative and faculty use, which will ensure the ultimate elimination of such barriers." 15/ While the University's undergraduate student affirmative action plan deals primarily with ethnic minorities, its plan for graduate students will address the needs of both ethnic minorities and women. The Task Force is expected to complete its long-range plan by March 1980.

Based upon the preliminary work of the Task Force, an interim plan was prepared that provided the basis for a State budget-augmentation request of $600,000, to fund "programs aimed at remedying the current underrepresentation of women, specific minority and low-income students in the University's graduate and professional schools." 16/ This proposal, submitted to the Governor in May 1979, called for: (1) the establishment of three different programs (Summer Research Training Institutes, Summer Enrichment Programs for University Undergraduates, and Faculty Mentor Programs) designed to increase the pool of eligible and interested underrepresented students; (2) expanded outreach efforts to contact underrepresented students and assist them in the application process; (3) expanded support services to provide additional academic tutors, as well as academic and personal advisement through the use of graduate peer counselors; and (4) systemwide coordination to develop standard information sharing, data collection, and program evaluation. While funds were not provided in the 1979-80 budget, the University has resubmitted the proposal for the 1980-81 budget session.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

The California State University and Colleges began its efforts to prepare a comprehensive systemwide plan with the appointment of a Student Affirmative Action Task Force in March 1977. Chancellor Dumke asked the Task Force to:

- examine existing data to determine systemwide student affirmative action progress;
- identify additional data needs and suggest means for obtaining such data;
- inventory and assess existing campus and system activities designed to address underrepresentation of historically underrepresented groups;
- suggest additional activities and determine the appropriate course of action; and
- prepare a plan for periodic evaluation of progress. 17/

The Task Force developed a three-phase plan addressing (1) access, (2) support/retention, and (3) evaluation/accountability. The first phase of the plan was submitted to the Chancellor in January 1978, with the second and third phases submitted the following June.

The Task Force reports provided the foundation for the Chancellor's report entitled, A Framework for Student Affirmative Action in the California State University and Colleges, which was submitted to the Postsecondary Education Commission in December 1978. This report was endorsed by the Statewide Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Council of Presidents as the segment's formal plan for student affirmative action.

Parallel with the development of a student affirmative action plan, the Chancellor's Office also undertook three other important activities during 1977-78.

- A student affirmative action Program Change Proposal (PCP) for $100,000 to fund two pilot programs was approved by the Governor. Two campuses--Dominguez Hills and Fresno--received approximately $50,000 each to develop model student affirmative action programs. A third pilot project was funded at the San Jose campus, using funds from unanticipated savings in the PCP, together with money from the State University Fund for Innovation and Improvement.

- In January 1978, the Board of Trustees endorsed the establishment of a Minority Teacher Early Identification Program in cooperation with the Los Angeles Unified School District. The purpose of the program is to increase the availability of bilingual/bicultural instructors. The program was implemented during the 1978-79 academic year.

- The third important development in student affirmative action was the appointment of an Acting Student Affirmative Action Coordinator in the Chancellor's Office. One of the initial responsibilities of the Acting Coordinator was to prepare the system's student affirmative action plan. In September 1979, a permanent coordinator was appointed.

The basic assumption of the State University's student affirmative action plan is that substantial increases in minority enrollments in higher education will not occur without fundamental reform and improvement in the academic preparation of such students during their elementary and secondary schooling. Consequently, the primary theme of the plan is the necessity to improve the State University's own education programs for teachers and counselors. The plan states that:

> . . . fundamental changes in the CSUC programs to prepare public school teachers, counselors, and administrators must be made, with emphasis given to the development of basic academic skills among ethnic minorities and to sensitive counseling and advisement areas vis-a-vis educational and career choices. . . . Improvement in teacher education programs may be considered the cornerstone of the CSUC student affirmative action plan because permanent gain in the representation of ethnic minorities in higher education will require improved counseling and preparation from kindergarten on. 18/

The systemwide plan is viewed as a framework to be used in the development of campus plans. Each State University campus has been asked to prepare a needs assessment--the socio-economic level of service-area populations, 19/ estimates of participation rates of high school graduates by ethnicity, proportion of limited or non-English speaking twelfth-grade students in the service-area population, etc.--and then develop its own comprehensive plan.

The concept of intersegmental coordination and cooperation receives considerable emphasis in the State University's plan, with the Postsecondary Education Commission identified as especially suited to promote this objective. The proposal is made that a California Equal Educational Opportunity Advisory Council be established to assist the Commission in its coordination and liaison activities. Regional, intersegmental consortia for early outreach and other related student affirmative action programs are also encouraged. The student affirmative action Program Change Proposal submitted by the State University in April 1979 called for the establishment of ten regional programs involving cooperation of Community Colleges and high schools with State University campuses.

The action plans in the Chancellor's report are presented in response to "ten identifiable barriers or sets of circumstances inhibiting improved representation of ethnic minorities." 20/ These identified barriers are: (1) inadequate data; (2) admissions criteria; (3) family financial concerns; (4) retention and remediation; (5) inadequate elementary and secondary preparation; (6) shortage of qualified bilingual/crosscultural public school and college personnel; (7) social, institutional, and cultural constraints; (8) motivation and aspirations; (9) campus and career-choice alternatives; and (10) child day-care facilities.

The action plans which address these barriers include both proposed studies and new actions. Of particular importance are the following proposed studies:

> The Chancellor's office staff will conduct a study of groups of EOP and other applicants admitted on the basis of grade point average and one alternative admissions criterion, as well as varying combinations of alternative admissions criteria . . . The study will compare the performance of those who received special support services and those who did not. The systemwide Committee on Alternative Admission Criteria will review the design, monitor the implementation, and review the results of the study. If the study establishes clearly that any alternative admission criterion would be a valid predictor of success in CSUC, it will be considered for acceptance as a basis for regular admission. 21/ [The estimated overall cost for this study is $30,000.]
>
> The Chancellor will seek to establish a Commission to (1) evaluate existing approaches for teaching basic skills to disadvantaged elementary and secondary students; (2) develop new methods as necessary; (3) select the most promising methods; and (4) assist campuses to incorporate these methods into CSUC pre- and in-service teacher education programs. Commission membership will be drawn from CSUC and elementary and secondary levels, and will include ethnic minority representation. 22/ [Funding for

the Commission during the initial five years would be approximately $2 million.]

The Chancellor will establish a task group to identify and describe cultural differences that inhibit minority participation in higher education and to develop methods for dealing with them. This should require about two years to complete. 23/ [The necessary funding will be approximately $250,000.]

Important new actions proposed in response to the identified barriers include the following:

The Chancellor's Office will request CSUC campuses to develop, in conjunction with junior and senior high schools in their service areas, special in-service training programs for school counselors who work with ethnic minority and disadvantaged students in order to increase sensitivity to the particular needs of these students. 24/

The Chancellor's Office will assume active leadership in encouraging campuses to expand and to improve those elements of teacher, counselor, and administrator pre- and in-service preparation programs which contribute to the capacities of elementary and secondary schools to better meet the needs of ethnic minorities. There will be emphasis on program components that emphasize a school's ability to work with bilingual/bicultural students in the development of basic academic skills. 25/

An expanded outreach program to high schools and students' homes has been proposed, utilizing bilingual personnel and materials and peer counselors. Funding for this expanded program was requested through a systemwide Program Change Proposal (PCP) in the 1978-79 and 1979-80 budget cycles. The model for this program was developed jointly by CSUC system staff and minority educators and counselors based on successful approaches at several campuses.

CSUC shall submit a proposal to the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Student Aid Commission for the establishment of a Higher Education Incentive Program designed to use financial aid credits as a method to motivate junior and senior high school students. 26/

CSUC, in cooperation with the two other systems of public postsecondary education, will conduct a conference to "explore ways in which faculty can better understand

> cultural differences and their relationship to student learning." 27/

The State University student affirmative action plan places particular emphasis on the importance of evaluation and the need for the Chancellor's Office to establish an advisory committee to review campus and system plans. This committee will have the responsibility to "develop guidelines for qualitative evaluation of student affirmative action programs. Emphasis will be placed on longitudinal studies." 28/ Each campus is expected to provide schedules for the development, implementation, and evaluation of its student affirmative action program.

In an effort to implement some of the recommendations contained in its systemwide plan, the Chancellor's Office submitted a Program Change Proposal for Fiscal Year 1979-80. This proposal, which the Legislature accepted and funded for approximately $725,000, will implement two specific actions in the State University's student affirmative action effort:

- The State University will expand its Joint Program with the Los Angeles Unified School District to include two high school districts in the State with large concentration of ethnic minorities. (The Legislature specified that both of these school districts be in rural areas.) This program is designed to "raise the aspirations of minority/low-income students, attract and prepare such students for college, and recruit, train, and place bilingual teachers." 29/ As it is being implemented in the Los Angeles region, the Joint Program involves four basic components: (1) a regional advisory group with representatives from high schools, Community Colleges, and the State University, which has the responsibility to "coordinate and deploy available resources to meet most effectively the needs of the regions" 30/; (2) paraprofessional outreach to high schools, using trained college students to assist professional staff; (3) extensive involvement of the parents in the outreach effort; and (4) in-service training programs designed to develop workshop models and materials that will provide relevant and accurate information to counselors to increase their awareness of the needs of ethnic minority students.

- The MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement) Program is to be expanded to provide centers on four additional State University campuses, and increased support is to be provided for the five existing MESA centers. The MESA Program provides ethnic minority high school students with (1) academic assistance and encouragement in developing basic skills in mathematics, (2) special guidance and career counseling, and

> (3) summer work experience and job placement. Five State University campuses currently participate in the Program--Northridge, Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Jose, and Sacramento. The four new MESA centers will be located on the San Diego, Fresno, Fullerton, and San Francisco campuses.

The Chancellor's Office clearly stated that without additional financial support from the Legislature and the Governor, the State University would be unable to implement most of the important recommendations of its student affirmative action plan.

> Of all the public segments, CSUC alone is dependent almost entirely on State funds for its budgeted resources. In other words, the chances of success for the CSUC plan are directly related to the degree to which State fiscal authorities will provide reasonable additional resources when justified and permit additional institutional flexibility in reallocating those already budgeted. 31/

The same report stated that, ". . .carrying out the system and campus student affirmative action plans will require augmentation and some reallocation of institutional resources." 32/ The Legislature and the Governor have demonstrated their willingness to provide additional resources to implement cooperative efforts by postsecondary institutions to increase educational opportunities for ethnic minorities.

The State University's framework for student affirmative action includes a discussion of the need to develop guidelines for the qualitative evaluation of affirmative action programs. The Chancellor's Office established a 20-member systemwide "advisory committee for the evaluation aspect of student affirmative action activities" 33/, with the committee having the responsibility to review campus and system programs and to assist in the development of mechanisms for evaluation. The Chancellor's Office submitted a Program Change Proposal for $75,000 in fiscal year 1980-81, to support this evaluation work.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A statewide student affirmative action plan for the California Community Colleges was adopted by the Board of Governors in February 1979. This plan is the result of three years of effort by the staff of the Chancellor's Office, working cooperatively with each of the districts. This cooperative effort was inhibited by several problems:

- variation among districts in the availability of relevant data;

- strong resistance by some districts to cooperating in any legislatively mandated task;

- concern whether State funding would be provided to implement the action plans;

- questions about the relationship of student affirmative action to the EOPS program; and

- lack of commitment on the part of some district personnel to student affirmative action efforts.

In responding to these problems, the Chancellor's Office staff conducted regional workshops during February and March of 1978 to provide the "opportunity to respond face-to-face to the questions and concerns of those persons charged with preparing the plans." 34/ On May 31, 1978, then Chancellor William Craig wrote to the Superintendents/Presidents, Deans of Student Services, Affirmative Action Officers and EOPS Directors, emphasizing the need to complete campus-level student affirmative action plans. Additional encouragement was provided by the Legislature in supplemental language to the 1978-79 State Budget, which provided that:

> The Chancellor's Office should make it clear to all colleges and districts that it is the intent of the Legislature for every community college district to have in operation an approved student affirmative action plan applicable to all colleges within the district. (Supplemental Budget Language, Item 341)

The effect of this budget language was to make funding for each district's EOPS program in 1979-80 dependent on development of an approved affirmative action plan. During the ensuing six months, all of the Community Colleges submitted such plans, the vast majority of which have been approved by the Chancellor's Office.

The primary theme of the Community College plan is the necessity for a thorough assessment of student affirmative action needs by each district in order to identify specific program priorities. 35/ This needs assessment would involve "a major, year-long effort to (1) refine the measures of underrepresentation, (2) comprehend the educational needs of the underrepresented from their point of view, and (3) develop programs and services which meet those needs." 36/ The plan is, therefore, essentially a framework to be used by each district in developing funding priorities for student affirmative action during the next few years. Accordingly, the Board of Governors requested a budget augmentation of $910,000 to be allocated to the districts for support staff responsible for "directing the district's needs assessment, identifying priority needs, and coordinating with the State-level effort." 37/ This request, however, was denied. The Legislature also denied a Board request for $40,000 to support a staff member in the Chancellor's Office responsible for:

(1) developing a common needs-assessment methodology;

(2) coordinating needs-assessment efforts in the districts;

(3) coordinating districts' submission of updates to their student affirmative action plans;

(4) maintaining liaison with student affirmative action efforts in other segments of postsecondary education;

(5) updating and refining the State-level student affirmative action plan to reflect the findings of the statewide need assessment; and

(6) creation of a statewide pool of qualified women and minority staff candidates to assist local districts with their affirmative action goals. 38/

Each Community College district is expected to conduct an annual review and update of its student affirmative action plan, which is to be submitted to the Chancellor for approval. The Board of Governors has directed the Chancellor to develop appropriate Title 5 regulations to provide for district compliance with State-level efforts in student affirmative action.

The framework for student affirmative action planning, as prepared by the Chancellor's Office, calls for each district or college to use the following format:

- Preamble Statement: The preamble should provide a specific statement of the problem of underrepresentation in the district, as well as a statement of the goals and a timetable for the achievement of these goals.

- Statistical Information: The composition of the student body within the Community College district should be compared with the composition of the twelfth-grade enrollment and the adult population within the district to determine the degree of underrepresentation by ethnicity and by sex. Districts are also expected to gather student/family income data biennially for comparison with community income data.

- Access/Outreach and Admission: "There is an intense and widespread need for community colleges to 'act affirmatively' in seeking out those who can most obviously benefit from the open-door policies which they expouse." 39/ Each plan is to include an inventory of existing outreach/recruitment programs, as well as a plan and schedule for developing new outreach programs.

- Retention/Student Support Mechanisms: "Once access is achieved, special student support mechanisms become critical for retaining students from underrepresented groups. Each plan should include a section on student support which includes subsections on: (a) student service programs, (b) faculty and staff awareness programs, and (c) financial aid." 40/ A comprehensive counseling plan is recommended, including personal, educational, vocational, and peer counseling. 41/ Major emphasis is also to be given to basic skills instruction, tutorial services, and financial assistance programs.

An important final statement in the Community College plan concerns the need for institutional commitment.

> Those institutions which have not fully embraced the student affirmative action concept must assess the consequences of continued neglect in this area. The actual existence and viability of the Community College is contingent on the formulation of new means for attracting and serving underrepresented groups. 42/

The plan discusses the need for activities to expand faculty, student, and staff awareness of underrepresented groups. These activities include special cultural awareness activities, formation of special student organizations which act as advocacy/awareness groups, and in-service training and instructor consultations.

AN ASSESSMENT OF SEGMENTAL PLANNING EFFORTS

The student affirmative action plans prepared by the public segments were intended to function as guides or frameworks for action by the campuses and the systemwide offices. As the recommended actions are implemented, the plans will be revised to reflect the new environment. For this reason, the plans should not be viewed as final documents, but rather as statements of intended short- and long-term actions.

A comprehensive planning process, and the development of an effective systemwide plan must include several phases:

- Phase I: Specific statement of planning objectives;
- Phase II: Identification and assessment of the barriers to the achievement of these objectives ("the needs assessment");
- Phase III: Inventory of existing resources being utilized to achieve the planning objectives;
- Phase IV: Development of action plans and a timetable for the implementation of these actions;
- Phase V: Implementation of the action plans;
- Phase VI: Development of mechanisms for both the on-going and the comprehensive evaluation of the action plans; and
- Phase VII: Development of mechanisms to facilitate the feedback and use of evaluation findings.

There has been a considerable difference among the segments in the progress made in student affirmative action planning. (See Table X-1.) On the undergraduate level, the University of California has moved to Phase VI, working now to develop and implement evaluation mechanisms for several programs initiated during the past three years. At the graduate level, the University is now preparing an inventory of existing resources, while also developing several specific action plans. The California State University and Colleges began its undergraduate-level planning activities three years after the University, and consequently has not made as much progress. The State University system has advanced to Phase V, seeking to implement many of the action plans. The least progress in systemwide planning has been made by the California Community Colleges, which are now beginning an assessment of the barriers to expanded educational opportunities for ethnic minorities, women, and low-income students.

TABLE X-1

STATUS OF STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANNING

	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Phase V	Phase VI	Phase VII
	State Objectives	Needs Assessment	Inventory Resources	Action Plans and Timetable	Implementation	Evaluation	Feedback
Community Colleges	———	——→					
State University and Colleges							
Undergraduate Level	———	———	———	——→			
Graduate Level							
University of California							
Undergraduate Level	———	———	———	———	———	——→	
Graduate Level	———	——→					

Table X-2 provides a summary of the programs and actions proposed in the systemwide student affirmative action plans and subsequent Program Change Proposals of the University and the State University. (The recommendations in the Community College plan is not included in this analysis, since those recommendations are guidelines for study, rather than specific programmatic actions.) As indicated earlier, the State University did not include a schedule for the implementation of many of its recommendations.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions and comments can be made concerning the student affirmative action plans prepared by the public segments:

1. The University of California and the California State University and College, are planning for the establishment and/or the expansion of twenty-five student-related affirmative action programs. Ten of these programs are directed to students in grades 7-12, eight to undergraduate students, and one to graduate students. The remaining programs are intended for adults not currently enrolled, teachers and counselors in elementary and secondary schools, and students making the transition from high school to college.

2. The primary emphasis of the above programs and actions is on recruitment of students from and outreach to the

secondary schools. Relatively little emphasis is given to (1) the retention of undergraduate students, and (2) recruitment and outreach efforts at the Community College level.

3. While each of the three public segments presented a general discussion of the need for intersegmental cooperation, only one of the proposed new student-related programs included an intersegmental component--the State University's Regional Paraprofessional Outreach Effort. Three programs recommended for expansion--College Motivation Days for American Indian students, RACHE College Days, and MESA--had an intersegmental component.

4. Only one of the student-related programs and actions (MESA) included the involvement of private industry, and only two (MESA and the Summer Enrichment Program for University Undergraduates) provided for role models from outside the academic community to motivate students.

5. Most of the emphasis in the segmental plans is placed on outreach efforts to high school students; none of the proposed student-related programs and actions is designed to encourage Community College students to transfer to four-year institutions.

6. The University and the State University have proposed four new programs designed to expand communications among colleges and universities about (1) successful student affirmative action programs, and (2) educational changes necessary to respond more effectively to the needs of ethnic minority and women students. The projected annual cost of these programs is $500,000.

7. Both the University and the State University have included among their proposed programs and actions the establishment of an evaluation mechanism. The University estimates that $50,000 to $100,000 of additional funding is needed for the evaluation. The State University requested $75,000 in funding for fiscal year 1980-81, to establish an evaluation mechanism. The information provided concerning the proposed evaluation mechanisms is not sufficient to assess their potential effectiveness.

TABLE X-2

PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS IN SYSTEMWIDE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

Classification of Programs by Target Group and Primary Purpose of Program:	Name of Program	New Program	Expansion of Existing Program	Date for Implementation	Additional Funding Needed for Program	Program Components: Intersegmental Component	Use of Peer Personnel	Faculty Involvement	Involvement of Parents	Use of Role Models	Involvement of Private Industry
I. Student Related Programs:											
A. K-12 Grade Students:											
1. Providing enriching learning experiences to K-6 grade students	UC-Community Teaching Fellowship Program (p. 30)		x	expanded in 1978-79			x				
2. Motivate 7-9 grade students to increase number of eligibles	UC-Partnership Program (p. 27)		x	in place	$1 million in 1978-79				x		
3. Motivate 7-12 grade students to pursue professions/vocations wherein minorities are underrepresented	CSUC-Expansion of MESA		x	1979-80	$160,000	x		x		x	x
4. Motivate 10-12 grade students to increase number of eligibles and/or Recruitment of eligible high school graduates	UC-Early High School Education (p. 29)		x	in place	$150,000 in 1978-79		x				
	UC-College Motivation Days-American Indian Students (p.32)		x	1977-78	$15,000 per year	x					
	UC-RACHE College Days (p. 32-33		x	in place		x					
	CSUC-Expand and Improve Regional Para-Professional Outreach (p. 50)		x		$1.1 million for 10 regions	x	x		x		
5. Provide information about career opportunities	CSUC-Faculty Career Consultants (p. 53)	x						x			

#53-da/66
Revised 5/31/79

TABLE X-2 (Continued)

PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS IN SYSTEMWIDE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

Classification of Programs by Target Group and Primary Purpose of Program:	Name of Program	New Program	Expansion of Existing Program	Date for Implementation	Additional Funding Needed For Program	Program Components: Intersegmental Component	Program Components: Use of Peer Personnel	Program Components: Faculty Involvement	Program Components: Involvement of Parents	Program Components: Use of Role Models	Program Components: Involvement of Private Industry
6. Provide information about postsecondary educational alternatives	UC-Comprehensive Media Plan (p. 22)	x		Fall 1978	Approximately $100,000 per year						
	CSUC-Counseling Programs for students denied admission (p.49)	x			Unknown						
B. Transition from secondary to postsecondary education:											
1. Improve skills of admitted students prior to registration											
2. Orientation programs to ease transition into college	CSUC-Chancellor will request campuses to develop programs (p. 51)	x									
3. Provide information about admissions proc.	CSUC-Small workshops and orientation meetings (p. 40)	x		$38,000			x				
C. Undergraduate Student:											
1. Academic counseling											
2. Career planning and/or job placement	CSUC-intensified career oriented activities (p. 43)	x									
3. Nonacademic counseling (dealing with stress, assertiveness training											
4. Provide language skills support for non- or limited-English-speaking peoples											

#53-de/66

TABLE X-2 (Continued)

PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS IN SYSTEMWIDE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

Classification of Programs by Target Group and Primary Purpose of Program:	Name of Program	New Program	Expansion of Existing Programs	Date for Implementation	Additional Funding Needed for Program	Program Components					
						Intersegmental Component	Use of Peer Personnel	Faculty Involvement	Involvement of Parents	Use of Role Models	Involvement of Private Industry
5. Provide Child Care Facilities	CSUC-Chancellor will encourage campuses to expand existing services (p. 53)		x		existing resources						
6. Encourage transfer of Community College students to 4-year institutions											
7. Provide information about student financial assistance											
8. Motivate undergraduate students to pursue professions/vocations wherein minorities are underrepresented											
9. Motivate undergraduate students to increase number of eligibles for graduate/professional schools	UC-CSAA Summer Research Training Institutes	x		1979-80	$176,160			x			
	UC-Summer Enrichment Programs for University Undergraduates	x		1979-80	$ 60,720			x		x	
	UC-Faculty Mentor Programs	x		1979-80	$ 13,120			x			
10. Recruitment of students for graduate/professional schools	UC-Outreach	x		1979-80	$ 50,000						
11. Faculty/institutional involvement programs	UC-Faculty involvement in SAA efforts (p. 22-23)	x		1978				x			
	CSUC-In-service campus training program (p. 49)	x						x			

#53-da/66

TABLE X-2 (Continued)

PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS IN SYSTEMWIDE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

						Program Components					
Classification of Programs by Target Group and Primary Purpose of Program:	Name of Program	New Program	Expansion of Existing Program	Date for Implementation	Additional Funding Needed for Program	Intersegmental Component	Use of Peer Personnel	Faculty Involvement	Involvement of Parents	Use of Role Models	Involvement of Private Industry
12. Provide information about graduate educational alternatives											
D. Graduate Students:											
1. Academic counseling	UC-Expanded Support Services for Underrepresented students	x		1979-80	$250,000		x				
2. Career planning and/or job placement											
3. Nonacademic counseling (dealing with stress, assertiveness training)											
4. Provide information about student financial assistance											
E. Adults Not in Postsecondary Education:											
1. Recruitment of veterans											
2. Recruitment of adults over 24 years of age											
3. Provide information about postsecondary educational alternatives	UC-Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program		x	1978-79 for expansion	$15,000 annually						

#53-da/66

TABLE X-2 (Continued)

PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS IN SYSTEMWIDE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

Classification of Programs by Target Group and Primary Purpose of Program:	Name of Program	New Program	Expansion of Existing Program	Date for Implementation	Additional Funding Needed For Program	Program Components					
						Intersegmental Component	Use of Peer Personnel	Faculty Involvement	Involvement of Parents	Use of Role Models	Involvement of Private Industry
F. K-12 Teachers and Counselors:											
1. Improve teacher preparation programs to respond to needs of ethnic minority students	CSUC-Expand and improve public school pre- and in-service preparation programs (p. 46-47)		x		within existing resources						
2. Increase number of bilingual-bicultural teachers	CSUC-Cooperative program with Los Angeles Unified School District (p. 46)		x	1978-79	$390,000						
3. Improve quality of counseling at junior and senior high schools for ethnic minorities	CSUC-In-service training programs for junior and senior high school counselors (p. 45)	x			unknown; may involve released staff time						
II. Program Evaluation and Development:											
A. Seek non-State or University funding to implement/expand SAA programs	UC-Efforts to secure support for specialized summer institutes (p. 23-24)	x		1978-70							
B. Evaluation of SAA program components	UC-Establishment of a Universitywide evaluation mechanism (p. 39-40)	x		1977-78	Approximately $50,000-$100,000 per year						
	CSUC-Periodic evaluation of Advising, Counseling, Career Planning and Placement and Testing Services for minorities and low-income students (p. 42)	x			Existing Resources						

TABLE X-2 (Continued)

PROPOSED PROGRAMS AND ACTIONS IN SYSTEMWIDE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

Classification of Programs by Target Group and Primary Purpose of Program:	Name of Program	New Program	Expansion of Existing Program	Date for Implementation	Additional Funding Needed For Program	Program Components: Intersegmental Component	Use of Peer Personnel	Faculty Involvement	Involvement of Parents	Use of Role Models	Involvement of Private Industry
C. Communicating with other institutions about successful SAA programs, potential model programs, necessary educational changes to respond to needs of ethnic minorities, etc.	UC-Seminars to present evaluative and organizational information on model programs (p. 40)	x		1978-79	$5,000-$10,000 per year	x		x			
	CSUC-Intersegmental Conference on the Training of Minority and Nontraditional Students (p. 43)	x			$30,000	x		x			
	CSUC-Commission to Improve the Teaching of Basic Skills in Disadvantaged Elementary and High School Students (p. 44)	x			$2 million over five years			x			
	CSUC-Task Force to Identify Cultural Factors Inhibiting Minority Enrollment, and necessary corrective measures (p. 48)	x			$250,000 over a two year period			x			

FOOTNOTES

1/ *A Report of the President's Task Force on Chicanos and the University of California*, July 1975.

2/ *Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College?* A report on a University of California Survey of the High School Class of '75, University of California, May 1978, p. 18.

3/ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

4/ See *The University of California's Partnership Program--The First 18 Months*--prepared by University of California Systemwide Administration, February 1978.

5/ As the University's student affirmative action plan states, "our major institutional thrust in this area during the next five years will focus on students in grades seven through twelve. While arguments might be made that achievement problems begin in earlier grades, we believe that the often-neglected intermediate school student--and his or her parents--is a more productive starting point at this time." *University of California Student Affirmative Action Plan*, p. 25-26.

6/ *University of California Student Affirmative Action Plan*, p. 17.

7/ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

8/ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

9/ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

10/ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

11/ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

12/ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

13/ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

14/ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

15/ "University of California Graduate Student Affirmative Action 1979-80 Interim Proposal," May 11, 1979, p. 2.

16/ Ibid., p. 3.

17/ Student Affirmative Action Task Force Report, Phase I - Access, The California State University and Colleges, December 1977, p. 2.

18/ A Framework for Student Affirmative Action in the California State University and Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, December 1978, p. 24.

19/ Campus service-area is defined as "the territory from which 80 to 85 percent of the campus student enrollment comes." Ibid., p. 11.

20/ Ibid., p. 23.

21/ Ibid., p. 39-40.

22/ Ibid., p. 44.

23/ Ibid., p. 48.

24/ Ibid., p. 45.

25/ Ibid., p. 46-47.

26/ Ibid., p. 41.

27/ Ibid., p. 43.

28/ Ibid., p. 57.

29/ "CSUC Student Affirmative Action 1979-80 Program Change Proposal (Revised)," dated April 20, 1979, p. 5.

30/ Ibid., p. 9.

31/ "A Framework for Student Affirmative Action in the California State University and Colleges," p. 25.

32/ Ibid., p. 26.

33/ Ibid., p. 55.

34/ "Student Affirmative Action Plan for the California Community Colleges," p. 3.

35/ The plan states that "the conduct of this expanded and refined needs assessment in all districts should be the highest statewide priority for the Community Colleges in 1979-80." Ibid., p. 15.

36/ Memo from William G. Craig, Chancellor, California Community Colleges to Richard L. Cutting, Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance, regarding the Board of Governors' Request for Student Affirmative Action Funds, dated April 23, 1979, p. 2.

37/ Ibid., p. 4.

38/ Ibid., p. 5.

39/ Ibid., p. 17.

40/ Ibid., p. 7.

41/ An essential element of the district plan is "a commitment by the administration board and faculty to the concept of counseling as a vital and integral part of the education process." Ibid., p. 21.

42/ Ibid., p. 51.

CHAPTER XI

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A COORDINATED STATEWIDE EFFORT IN STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

In Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151, the Legislature concluded that "certain groups, as characterized by sex, ethnic, or economic background, are underrepresented in our institutions of public higher education . . . ." In the five years since the adoption of that Resolution, there has been minimal progress in increasing the enrollment levels of ethnic minority students. This report has emphasized several themes which describe the current status of student affirmative action efforts in California. These themes can be summarized briefly as:

- The goals of ACR 151 will not be achieved until a larger proportion of ethnic minority and low-income students (1) receive better academic training in grades K-12, and (2) graduate from high school. The postsecondary community has an obligation to work with the Department of Education and the elementary and secondary schools in efforts to increase and improve the academic motivation and preparation of ethnic minority and low-income students.

- While all of the ethnic minority groups considered in this report can be served more effectively by the State's public postsecondary institutions, the underrepresentation of Chicano students is particularly severe, inasmuch as they constitute the largest and fastest-growing ethnic minority group in California.

- During recent years, there has been a substantial financial commitment by both the federal and State governments to support programs designed to expand educational opportunities for ethnic minority and low-income citizens. While additional financial resources can always be used to establish new and desirable programs, it is particularly imperative now that the existing level of resources be used more effectively. Accordingly, there is a need for more extensive evaluations of student affirmative action programs in order to identify those strategies which have been either successful or unsuccessful in expanding educational opportunities for minority students.

- Many innovative student affirmative action programs have been implemented during the past few years designed both to improve the academic preparation of ethnic minority students enrolled in junior and senior high schools and to raise their aspirations to attend college. It can be expected that these programs will begin to have an impact on postsecondary enrollment levels by ethnic minority students during the next few years, as the program participants complete their final year of high school work.

- There is a general lack of formal cooperative efforts among postsecondary institutions in outreach programs designed to assist ethnic minority and low-income students gain access to postsecondary education.
- While there are a multitude of federal, State-, and institutionally funded student affirmative action programs, there is inadequate coordination among them to ensure the effective use of available resources and the elimination of undesirable duplication.
- Most of the emphasis in existing student affirmative action programs has been placed on the recruitment of ethnic minorities into postsecondary institutions. There is a need to place increased emphasis on assisting nontraditional students in (1) transferring from two-year to four-year institutions, and (2) persisting in college through the completion of a baccalaureate, master's, and/or doctoral degree.

PRIORITIES IN THE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EFFORT

Given these themes, the following general policy statements are presented to help identify the priorities in student affirmative action. Over time, as the student affirmative action effort evolves, these policy statements will be discussed with interested parties, reviewed, and altered, if necessary.

1. The need to improve the quality of education received by ethnic minority and low-income students in California's public schools is the fundamental and overriding issue which must be addressed before equal educational opportunity can become a reality in postsecondary education. The primary responsibility for statewide leadership on this issue rests with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the State Department of Education. However, the postsecondary institutions have an obligation to work with the Department and the elementary and secondary schools in this effort. Outreach efforts into junior and senior high schools should involve explicit cooperative arrangements among the postsecondary institutions involved, as well as with the secondary schools. The development of these cooperative arrangements should be a matter of high priority for all segments of education.

2. The California Community Colleges is the publicly supported system primarily responsible for providing the initial two years of postsecondary education. This system's EOPS program is an extensive outreach, support service, and financial aid effort for the State's low-income (and predominantly ethnic minority) students. In order to have the desired impact, however, the perspective of this program must move beyond the two or three years in which the low-income EOPS student is enrolled in a Community College. An important responsibility of the program is to encourage and assist the student in his or her efforts to transfer to a four-year institution and complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree. The Chancellor's Office should actively work with the systemwide staffs of both the University of California and the California State University and Colleges in making their "educational opportunity programs" a cooperative effort to help ethnic minority, low-income students achieve a baccalaureate degree.

3. The California State University and Colleges has the major responsibility for preparing teachers, counselors, and administrators to work with students in the public schools. The evidence available thus far indicates that these training programs have not been entirely successful in preparing their graduates to respond to the special educational needs and cultural backgrounds of ethnic minority students. During the coming decade, the State University should make long-range, fundamental changes in its teacher training programs, placing emphasis on the need for sensitive and competent counseling, advisement, and academic training for ethnic minorities. The State University should also continue to give priority to working with school districts in the development of in-service training programs for teachers, counselors, and administrators, to address the same issue.

4. The California State University and Colleges and the University of California are both responsible for providing the final two years of baccalaureate education for the majority of students transferring from the Community Colleges. While progress has been made during the past year in cooperative efforts to facilitate the transfer of ethnic minority and low-income students, there is still considerable area for improvement. The State University and the University should increase their efforts to work with the Community Colleges to reduce the obstacles to transfer and subsequent completion of a baccalaureate program.

5. The University of California is the State-supported institution responsible for offering professional curricula and awarding the doctoral degree. If ethnic minorities, women, and low-income people are to be integrated into the higher income levels of the California economy and the decision-making levels of the California polity, their representation in the University's professional and graduate programs must increase significantly. The University has the primary responsibility to address this problem, the solution of which should be given high priority in that segment's student affirmative action effort.

6. The California Student Aid Commission is responsible for the development and implementation of financial assistance programs which respond to the needs of low-income students. Federal, State, and institutional student aid programs apparently have been successful in reducing the "cost of college" as a barrier to low-income students. There is a need, however, for State-funded programs to be made more flexible (in terms of deadlines and eligibility) and to be simplified (in terms of the application process) so that more low-income students may seek to utilize these programs. The Student Aid Commission should respond to this issue and develop programs that recognize and respond to the needs of the low-income prospective college student.

7. The California Postsecondary Education Commission will promote intersegmental coordination and cooperation in statewide student affirmative action efforts. With its statewide perspective, the Commission is in a position to identify unnecessary duplication in program effort, facilitate the distribution of information about programs among educational institutions, coordinate statewide public information activities concerning student affirmative action, and identify programs and strategies which are both necessary and effective in achieving the goal of equal educational opportunity.

8. During the past five years, the Legislature and the Governor have provided considerable financial support for student affirmative action programs. During the next five years, those who review proposals for additional funding should keep three principles uppermost in their minds:

   - All student affirmative action programs should include an evaluation component to provide a means for assessing the effectiveness of the program. While evaluations are essential, they also are expensive, time-consuming, and require technical expertise to produce.

- Regional cooperative efforts in outreach appear to be more effective than efforts by individual institutions in improving communication among campuses, reaching students outside the college mainstream, and assisting applicants deemed ineligible for admission. The public postsecondary institutions should be expected to allocate a portion of the State funds provided for student affirmative action to support regional cooperative efforts.

- Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP/S), student financial assistance programs, bilingual education programs, campus-based child care programs, the School Improvement Program, and federally funded special education programs, are all part of the statewide student affirmative action effort. Proposals to fund new student affirmative action programs should reflect a conscious effort to avoid unnecessary duplication of existing programs, as well as to maximize the coordination of their resources.

9. Formal cooperative efforts among postsecondary institutions from different segments can be most effective in the coordination of outreach efforts. Such intersegmental efforts are desirable in the following areas:

   - Programs to motivate junior and senior high school students to attend college.

   - Programs to improve the academic preparation of junior and senior high school students.

   - Programs to motivate junior and senior high school students to pursue professions in which minorities are underrepresented.

   - Programs to provide information about educational alternatives for adults not enrolled in an educational institution.

   - Programs to utilize the media (particularly television and radio) to motivate minority children, and their parents, to prepare for college.

   - Programs to assist ethnic minority students in transferring from a Community College to a four-year institution in order to complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree.

10. Efforts by individual postsecondary institutions can be most effective in implementing support programs designed to help ethnic minority and low-income students complete a college program in a timely fashion. Student affirmative action efforts implemented and directed by a single institution are desirable in the following:

- Programs to assist students in the transition from high school to college;
- Programs to increase the retention of undergraduate students;
- Programs to assist college students with career planning; and
- Programs to help faculty, administrators, and staff become more aware of and sensitive to the differing cultural and educational backgrounds of ethnic minorities.

11. There is a need to increase substantially the representation of ethnic minorities and women in faculty, administrative, and managerial positions at California's public colleges and universities. Ethnic minorities are important as role models for both minority and majority students, all of whom must learn to live in a multicultural society. In California, however, more than 88 percent of the full-time faculty employed at public institutions are white, while less than 4 percent are either Chicano or Black. Among the executive/administrative staff, more than 86 percent are white, with less than 5 percent Chicano and less than 7 percent Black. Furthermore, the composition of the faculty and executive/administrative staff is more than 75 percent male in all public segments.

    As an essential component in the statewide student affirmative action effort, California's colleges and universities should make a concerted effort to increase the number of ethnic minorities and women employed in full-time faculty and executive/administrative positions.

ASSESSING THE PARTICIPATION RATE OF ETHNIC MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

During the past five years there has been a significant improvement in the quantity and quality of data concerning the enrollment of ethnic minorities and women in postsecondary, degree-granting institutions. Despite this progress, however, there are several areas in which data collection must be improved in order to provide the basis for a complete analysis. For example, many campuses experience a high nonresponse rate from students asked to identify their ethnicity. The data necessary to assess the persistence rate of students are generally not collected. Data are not available concerning the ethnic and sex composition of either high school graduates or students eligible for admission to the University of California and the California State University and Colleges. All of these data are needed in order to assess progress in expanding educational opportunities for ethnic minorities and women.

Recommendation 1

Individual campuses and the three systemwide offices should continue their efforts to reduce the nonresponse rate among students asked to identify their ethnicity. Information on methods to successfully gather ethnicity data should be shared among institutions and segments. This problem should be given high priority by the research and information systems staffs in each of the segments. In addition, *the public institutions should request students identifying their ethnicity as American Indian to use identification procedures recommended by the Bureau of Indian Affairs*.

Recommendation 2

The State Department of Education should continue to collect biennial data concerning the ethnic and sex composition of (1) high school graduates and students in grades K-12 (by grade level and by school), and (2) of faculty and of administrative and other credentialed staff (by school).

Recommendation 3

The California Postsecondary Education Commission, working cooperatively with the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, the State Department of Education, and the California Community Colleges, should determine the ethnic, sex, and income composition of those students eligible as high school graduates or Community College transfer students for admission to the University and the State University. This analysis should be updated every five years. The staff of the Postsecondary Education Commission should determine the amount of funding necessary to complete this project, and then seek funding from the appropriate agencies.

Recommendation 4

The Commission's Intersegmental Task Force on Admissions and Articulation should continue to develop proposals for the collection and maintenance of data necessary to assess the persistence rate of all students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The institutions should determine the amount of funding necessary to complete this project, and then seek funding from the appropriate agencies.

ADDRESSING THE NEED FOR MORE FORMAL COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

There are a multitude of campus-based, student affirmative action programs funded by the State, federal and local governments, as well as by private industry, private foundations, and/or educational institutions. An inventory of these programs indicates that few have an intersegmental component, involve private industry and/or local government, or include an evaluation component. There also seems to be little linkage between federally funded and State-funded programs, and between programs administered by the Department of Education and those administered by postsecondary institutions. While the three systemwide "educational opportunity programs" have been the major component of the student affirmative action effort during the past ten years, there has been little formal, intersegmental cooperation in the outreach effort among EOP/S staff at different campuses within the same geographic region.

The intersegmental consortia designed to provide information about postsecondary alternatives to high school students have apparently been successful in (1) reaching students outside the college mainstream, (2) improving communication among the campuses in the region, (3) reducing undesirable duplication of services and competition for students, and (4) providing assistance to applicants deemed ineligible for admission. At the present time, however, the number of consortia designed to perform this function is limited, primarily because current budgetary policies promote independent outreach and recruiting efforts by individual institutions, rather than by cooperative, coordinated efforts.

If further progress is to be made in expanding educational opportunities for ethnic minority, low-income, and women students, and if available financial resources are to be utilized most efficiently, it is essential that more cooperative outreach efforts in student affirmative action be undertaken by postsecondary institutions within the same geographic region and among the several segments. While the recommendations which follow signify the intention of the Commission to foster greater formal regional cooperation and coordination, such references to regional coordination are not intended to preclude present and planned informal and formal intersegmental cooperation on the campus, regional, and statewide levels.

Recommendation 5

In order to coordinate the student affirmative action efforts on the statewide level, *the California Postsecondary Education Commission should establish a California Equal Educational Opportunity Advisory Committee, with representation from the four segments of higher education, the State Department of Education, and MESA, as well as from campus-based student affirmative action projects funded by the federal and/or State governments*. (It is assumed that the existing Ad Hoc Intersegmental Committee on Student Affirmative Action would be transformed into this advisory committee after consultation with the segments and persons with special expertise in student affirmative action programs.) This Committee would have among its responsibilities the following: (1) systematic exchange of information about current and proposed student affirmative action programs among systemwide and campus-based personnel; (2) establishment of guidelines for the creation of any new outreach programs in the junior and senior high schools, in order to ensure an emphasis on cooperative intersegmental efforts for student motivation and preparation; and (3) the provision of advice to the Commission as it carries out its leadership role in the coordination of the statewide student affirmative action effort.

Recommendation 6

Wherever feasible, *the postsecondary institutions should develop and/or expand regional intersegmental cooperative efforts in student affirmative action*. The primary purposes of each such effort should be to (1) increase the exchange of information about student affirmative action programs within a region; (2) expand the involvement of representatives from private industry, local government, and community organizations in student affirmative action programs; and (3) expand the areas of cooperation between secondary schools and postsecondary institutions in outreach programs designed to improve the academic preparation and motivation of ethnic minority students. Participants in these regional efforts should include representatives from the secondary schools and the four segments of collegiate education. In addition, representatives from the following should be considered: local government, private industry, and community organizations. (The advisory committees utilized by the MESA program provide an organizational model for the proposed regional intersegmental efforts. The ten regional organizations developed by the California Community Colleges for the administration of its EOPS program might be a useful geographical model to follow in the development of these regional advisory committees.)

Recommendation 7

The outreach efforts of the Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP/S) in the three public segments within the same geographic region should be coordinated through formal intersegmental cooperative efforts, similar to the South Coast and the Central Coast EOP/S Consortiums.

Recommendation 8

The systemwide offices of the California State University and Colleges, the University of California, and the California Community Colleges should develop and implement an action plan to facilitate the transfer of students from the Community College EOPS program into the University and State University EOP programs. While there are differences among the three segments in the scope and purpose of their programs it is important that a Community College EOPS student who wants to continue his or her education in order to earn a baccalaureate degree be eligible to receive EOP support services, if needed, at the University or the State University. At the present time, most EOPS transfer students are not eligible for such services. While it is premature to revise the relevant statutes in order to make the programs explicitly compatable, the systemwide offices should place a high priority on determining the extent of the problem and developing alternatives to resolve it.

Recommendation 9

The Legislature and the Governor should provide annual funding for the California Student Opportunity and Access Program (CAL-SOAP) for at least three additional years. The establishment of CAL-SOAP has stimulated cooperative efforts among many campuses in an attempt to secure State funds for the establishment of intersegmental consortia. The enabling legislation provided funding for the initial year of operation of five consortia, but none for succeeding years. Prior to January 1983, the California Postsecondary Education Commission will complete an evaluation of the effectiveness of this program, with this evaluation providing a basis for decisions about its continued funding.

Recommendation 10

The Legislature, in the 1978 Budget Act, expressed its intent for improved intersegmental coordination of student affirmative action/outreach efforts. The Legislature should continue to encourage the University of California and the California State University and Colleges to use State funds as appropriate to initiate and stimulate cooperative, intersegmental student affirmative action efforts.

Recommendation 11

The Postsecondary Education Commission, with the advice of the California Equal Educational Opportunity Advisory Committee (as discussed in Recommendation 5) should develop guidelines for the creation of any new outreach programs, review and comment on proposed programs, and monitor all existing programs to assess their effectiveness.

The University of California's Partnership Program is the major State-funded effort by a postsecondary institution to improve the academic preparation and motivation of students in junior high schools. Thus far, similar early outreach programs have not been implemented by other postsecondary institutions. In its Student Affirmative Action Plan, the University recommended that, when it is determined an intersegmental effort in early outreach would be most effective, an intersegmental committee should be

> . . . empowered to establish quidelines for the creation of any new partnership agreements between schools and colleges, review and approve proposed agreements, and . . . oversee all programs to ensure an emphasis on student motivation and preparation, rather than recruitment [page 28].

While the responsibility to negotiate and implement partnership agreements between schools and colleges should remain with the individual campuses, there is a need to coordinate these programs.

ADDRESSING THE NEED FOR EFFICIENT USE OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The federal and State governments currently provide more than $60 million annually to support campus-based student affirmative action programs at California colleges and universities. These programs are complemented by special projects in the secondary schools, as implemented by the State Department of Education, as well as by student financial assistance programs, bilingual education programs, and campus-based child care programs. While the level of federal and State funding for these programs has increased almost every year during the past decade, this trend should not be expected to continue through the coming ten-year period. It is the responsibility of public postsecondary institutions and their systemwide offices to implement methods for using existing resources more effectively, as well as to provide a more effective accounting of the impact and results of these various programs.

The 1979 Budget Act provided that, prior to legislative review of the 1980-81 budget, the California Postsecondary Education Commission is to review and make recommendations on all existing and proposed outreach programs to ensure that (a) the proposal (or program) does not duplicate an existing effort, (b) existing resources are being utilized adequately, and (c) proper attention is given to developing and utilizing intersegmental consortia.

Recommendation 12

The Postsecondary Education Commission should continue to review and make recommendations on all existing and proposed outreach programs, working with the systemwide offices to ensure there is sufficient coordination among the segments to provide an efficient use of resources, as well as to avoid unnecessary program duplication.

In the development of proposals for new outreach programs, and in the efforts to maintain and improve existing efforts, California's public postsecondary institutions should consider the following principles in reaching their decisions: Comprehensive use of existing resources: The full range of federal, State, institutional, and private resources should be used in all current and expanded outreach efforts. Coordinated effort among the segments: Efforts to increase and improve the academic preparation and motivation of ethnic minority students in junior and senior high schools should be undertaken cooperatively by the three public segments, working together with the public schools. Coordinated effort within the institution: Efforts to increase the enrollment of ethnic minority students should involve the coordinated use of all of a campus's available resources including faculty, staff from the Office of School Relations (or similar office), staff from a campus-based program, and EOP/S staff. Continuity of program services: Students should feel the influences of the outreach program over a period of years, not just in one summer, in one classroom, or from just one teacher. Accountability: Outreach programs should include an evaluation component to provide for an assessment of their effects on students. Involvement of non-college personnel: Parents, private industry, local government, and community groups should be involved in the outreach effort wherever possible. Children are more likely to enroll in college if parents support their efforts to prepare for and attend college. Private industry and local government provide potential job opportunities and role models of successful minorities. Expanded retention efforts: As outreach efforts are successful in increasing the enrollment of ethnic minority students, there will be an expanded need for an effective response from faculty, administrators, and counseling staff to assist these nontraditional students in achieving their educational objectives.

Recommendation 13

In reviewing budgetary Program Change Proposals for outreach efforts in student affirmative action, the Department of Finance and the Legislature should place particular emphasis on those which have been prepared through a coordinated effort among the three public postsecondary segments and the Department of Education, and which complement existing student affirmative action efforts within each segment.

Recommendation 14

The Governor and the Legislature should give explicit consideration to the relationship between funding requests for student affirmative action and educational opportunity programs (EOP/S) in the review of segmental budgets. While there are important differences between the two programs which should not be eliminated, both programs are designed to assist low-income, educationally disadvantaged students and are therefore complementary. Each public segment, including the University of California, should be expected to provide information about its EOP/S program as part of its request and justification for General Fund support for student affirmative action programs.

STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AS A COMPREHENSIVE EFFORT

The concept of student affirmative action should be viewed by postsecondary institutions as a comprehensive set of programs designed to provide (1) outreach services to students in the secondary schools, (2) support services to college students, (3) financial assistance to low-income students, (4) child care services to low-income students with dependent children, (5) academic training to students with limited-English or non-English speaking ability, (6) staff development training for faculty and administrators to increase sensitivity to and understanding of nontraditional students, (7) special admissions opportunities for individuals with academic potential who are ineligible under regular admissions standards, and (8) quality academic programs designed to benefit nontraditional students.

Within the framework of this definition, student affirmative action should involve all components of the college community, including faculty, administrators, and Office of School Relations staff, as well as staff in the EOP/S program. The Student Affirmative Action Plan for the Community Colleges, as adopted by the Board of Governors, provides a clear statement of this broad and comprehensive concept of student affirmative action:

> The essential element required for achievement of the goals specified for student affirmative action is institutional commitment to the total concept. Where this concept has been supported in the past, institutional regeneration may be the only means for moving beyond the status quo. This regeneration should commence with a critical reevaluation of present assumptions and programs affecting underrepresented groups. Those institutions which have not fully embraced the student affirmative action concept must assess the consequences of continued neglect in this area. The actual existence and viability of the community college is contingent on the formulation of new means for attracting and serving underrepresented groups. 1/

While educational opportunity programs are an important part of student affirmative action, they are only a portion of the comprehensive effort which is needed at all of the colleges and universities throughout California.

Special Action and Exception Admissions Programs

The "special action" and "exception admissions" programs of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges have had a major role in increasing the number of ethnic minorities enrolled at these institutions. For example, at the University in Fall 1977, approximately 39 percent of all Black freshmen and 32 percent of all Chicano freshmen were admitted as special action/disadvantaged students. During the past ten years the expansion of these programs has been responsible for the admission of increasingly larger numbers of minority students. However, the number of admissions by exception can be expected to decrease annually during the next decade as the general enrollment at the University and the State University declines, since the number of students admitted annually under the exception admissions category is tied directly to annual enrollments or applications received for all students. Accordingly, the special admissions program for disadvantaged students will play a decreasing role in the statewide effort to expand educational opportunities for ethnic minorities.

Recommendation 15

In the outreach component of statewide student affirmative action efforts, the primary emphasis should continue to be on preparing ethnic minority and low-income students for regular admission to the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, rather than on expanding the size of the "exception admissions" category.

Recommendation 16

In measuring an applicant's potential for academic success in undergraduate study, the University of California and the California State University and Colleges should consider utilizing alternative admissions criteria to supplement grade-point average. These alternative criteria might include structured interviews, autobiographical statements, and letters of recommendation. The experiences of past and present EOP students might be an excellent source of data concerning alternative admissions criteria that would be valid predictors of success in college.

Student Financial Assistance Programs

During the past ten years there has been a tremendous growth in the amount of student financial assistance available to eligible undergraduate students in California colleges and universities. As a result, the current primary problem in student financial assistance is not so much an inadequate amount of money for eligible students as the necessity of adapting the programs to serve the needs of the low-income student more effectively. In addition, since the vast majority of student financial aid funds are targeted for undergraduate students (less than 2 percent is specifically available for graduate students), there apparently is a need to expand the amount of financial assistance available for low-income students to pay for a portion of the costs of graduate-level education. The Legislature, through supplemental language to the 1978 Budget Act, established the Student Financial Aid Policy Study Group, requesting this body to report in January 1980 on all aspects of student aid, including the development of a policy framework for future programs.

Recommendation 17

The Student Aid Commission should initiate actions to implement the following recommendations.*

- A study of the nature, extent and need for financial assistance by low-income graduate and professional school students should be completed.
- The structure of the Cal Grant programs should be revised to provide a longer application filing period and a more simplified application form.
- The Cal Grant B and C programs should be revised to provide a more accessible program structure responding to the needs of California's lowest-income students.

Recommendation 18

The Student Aid Commission should work cooperatively with the postsecondary institutions to develop an intersegmental media campaign designed to increase awareness among low-income, ethnic minority communities of the availability of financial assistance and alternative methods of financing an education.

Recommendation 19

The Legislature should provide funding to the Student Aid Commission to be used in support of campus-based pilot projects designed to provide significant career-related work experiences for low-income students who are attending college through the assistance of federal Work-Study funds. Participation in federal Work-Study programs appears to encourage the continued attendance of ethnic minorities and women in college. During the 1978-79 fiscal year, approximately $37 million in Work-Study funds were utilized by California colleges and universities. As federal funding of these programs increases, funds should be used by institutions to support expanded learning experiences for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students in order to increase the number who (1) graduate from high school, (2) achieve eligibility for and enroll in a college or university which awards the baccalaureate degree, and (3) enter mathematics-based disciplines and professions.

---

*These same recommendations were made by the Student Financial Aid Policy Study Group in its January 1980 report to the Legislature.

Programs to Meet the Needs of Students with Dependent Children

Nearly all of the students with dependent children are women, members of minority groups, and/or have low income. For these students, the availability of child-care services can be a critical factor in the decision to begin, return to, or continue their college education. Thus, child care is a concern in student affirmative action. Publicly subsidized care is of particular importance to low-income students with dependent children.

The major issues in meeting the needs of these students involve the following:

- Demographic, social, and economic indicators reveal that the need for publicly subsidized and nonsubsidized child care is expected to increase over the next five years. As the competition to participate in child care programs increases, students will find it increasingly difficult to find space for their children. The reasons are twofold: (1) availability of campus-based child care is extremely limited; and (2) publicly subsidized programs in the community generally give priority to working parents and parents in training for "immediate employment" (usually interpreted as short-term vocational programs).

- A special need exists to provide campus-based child care services for low-income graduate and professional-school students. Because federal regulations do not recognize education beyond the baccalaureate as "leading to immediate employment," these students are unable to use publicly subsidized child care services in the community.

- State and local support for campus-based child care services has been unstable from its inception. State funding has been subject to annual legislative review and approval, while local funding has been subject to campus priorities, administrative approval, and other related factors. During 1979-80, the only child care programs required to provide a 12.5 percent match to qualify for State funds will be campus-based programs. Since the passage of Proposition 13, many campus-based programs have experienced the loss of matching funds.

Recommendation 20

The Legislature should recognize that the availability of child care in general, and campus-based care in particular, are critical factors in determining whether low-income women and minorities with dependent children begin, return to, or continue their college education. In doing so, the Legislature should (1) eliminate the 12.5 percent matching share, currently required of campus child-care programs for the receipt of State funds; and (2) give priority in funding child care programs to those for low-income student parents who are not currently being served. Priority should also be given to child care programs for low-income parents who are graduate and professional-school students and who do not qualify for publicly subsidized programs.

Recommendation 21

The question of unmet need for child care services for low-income, ethnic minority, and women students attending postsecondary institutions should be addressed on a regional basis.

In assessing this need, the campuses within each region should prepare an extensive inventory of available child care services as a basis for (1) providing complete information to students, and (2) determining the amount of additional State funding which may be required.

Meeting the Educational Needs of the Limited-English and Non-English Speaking Persons in California

The increasing ethnic-minority composition of California is paralleled by the increasing number of residents with limited-English or non-English speaking (LES/NES) ability. The issue of meeting the educational needs of LES/NES citizens is considered within the context of equal educational opportunity because there is a need to (1) provide the growing number of LES/NES students enrolled in grades K-12 with the skills needed for success in postsecondary education, (2) prepare teachers who are capable of providing K-12 instruction that is comprehensible to the LES/NES student, and (3) assist the LES/NES adult in preparing for a postsecondary education and meaningful employment.

The training of bilingual teachers has increased dramatically over the past four years, yet there remains a significant disparity between the supply of, and the demand for, qualified bilingual teachers. It is estimated that, currently, the supply of bilingual teachers meets less than 60 percent of the need. There has been considerable debate in the Legislature on the structure of bilingual education. Each of the proposals discussed during the 1978-79 session would have had a significant impact on the demand for bilingual teachers. The question has not been resolved and is expected to be an issue during the 1979-80 legislative session. However, additional bilingual teachers will be needed regardless of the specific proposal adopted.

In responding to the needs of LES/NES adults, some Community Colleges have developed bilingual and/or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs designed either to provide vocational training or the academic background necessary for transfer to a four-year institution. Again, however, there is clearly a need for more of the Community Colleges, particularly those located within minority populated communities, to establish similar programs.

Another area in which changes are needed to respond more effectively to the educational needs of LES/NES students is that of coordination among agencies responsible for the administration of State and federal funding for bilingual education. The Ad Hoc Interagency Task Force, established by the 1977 Budget Act, has served as a vehicle for increased communication and cooperation between these agencies. However, there is a need for continued leadership from the Task Force in areas of mutual concern and shared responsibility, e.g., administration of the Bilingual Teacher Corp Program, determination of supply and demand, and implementation of proposed changes approved by the Legislature for 1979-80.

Recommendation 22

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges should encourage the establishment of Community College programs to prepare bilingual teacher aides. In addition, the Chancellor's Office, in cooperation with the California State University and Colleges and the University of California, should establish a model curriculum, including minimum standards for career-ladder programs.

Recommendation 23

The California State University and Colleges should develop additional cooperative programs between its campuses and secondary schools designed to identify and recruit ethnic minority/low-income students, and to train and place these students as bilingual teachers. The State University/Los Angeles Unified School District Student Affirmative Action Program provides a useful model which could be adopted in other regions, if the pilot program proves to be effective.

Recommendation 24

The educational needs of limited-English and non-English speaking adults should be addressed on a regional basis by the secondary and postsecondary institutions working cooperatively within that region. In assessing these needs, the campuses within each region with a large LES/NES adult population should prepare an extensive inventory of available educational resources as a basis for (1) providing complete information to LES/NES adults, and (2) determining the amount of additional State funding which may be required.

ADDRESSING THE NEED FOR INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT TO STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

While primary emphasis in this report has been placed on programs to assist ethnic minority and low-income peoples prepare for college, there is also a need for programs to assist faculty and administrative staff prepare for the new type of student who will be participating in postsecondary education. Faculty and staff need to have a better understanding of and sensitivity to the cultural and educational backgrounds of ethnic minority and low-income students. College and university curricula should reflect this understanding and sensitivity.

Recommendation 25

The systemwide offices of each of the three public segments should work cooperatively with their campuses to develop and implement a comprehensive set of activities designed to expand faculty and administrative staff awareness regarding underrepresented student groups. This activity should have a high priority in the segment's student affirmative action effort. In the next report pursuant to ACR 151, which is due on or before July 1, 1980, each of the public segments should report on the specific activities to be initiated during academic year 1980-81.

Recommendation 26

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges should establish programs designed to help campus-based staff gain a better understanding of the four-year public institutions and their relationship to the Community Colleges. Similarly, the systemwide offices of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges should establish programs designed to help campus-based staff expand their understanding of the role of the Community Colleges.

Recommendation 27

Involvement in student affirmative action programs should be considered as part of teaching, research, and community service, in decisions relating to faculty tenure, promotion, and salary.

There should be incentives for faculty to involve themselves in activities such as conducting workshops for minority high school students, developing mentor-type relationships with minority students, and coordinating career oriented internships for minority and women students.

ADDRESSING THE NEED FOR IMPROVED EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

State-funded programs designed to expand educational opportunities for ethnic minorities, women, and low-income people must receive the same thorough evaluation as do all education programs. This evaluation would provide the basis for assessing both the costs and the effectiveness of each program, as well as the information necessary to make an informed choice among new and existing programs during a period of overall budget constraints. Thus far, there has been only minimal evaluation of most of the student affirmative action programs, and it is difficult to determine which have been successful and which have not.

Recommendation 28

In the next report pursuant to ACR 151, which is due on or before July 1, 1980, each of the public segments should report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission on the progress made in implementing the actions proposed in the segment's student affirmative action plan. Each segment should also include in its report a complete inventory of campus-based student affirmative action programs, as well as all available information concerning the effectiveness of these programs. In addition, each of the public segments should include information on its efforts to (1) prepare ethnic minorities and women to participate in the full range of academic disciplines, including mathematical and scientific disciplines, (2) improve the academic persistence rate of ethnic minority students admitted as a result of current outreach programs, and (3) expand the degree of intersegmental cooperation in outreach efforts.

Recommendation 29

The systemwide offices of each segment should prepare a comprehensive evaluation of each State-funded student affirmative action program. This evaluation should appraise the program's merit and determine the consistency with which it produces the desired outcome. Beginning with the 1981-82 budget cycle, each program evaluation should be updated annually, and submitted to the Legislature as part of the annual request for funding.

Recommendation 30

The two primary target groups in undergraduate student affirmative action are ethnic minority and low-income students. On the graduate level, a third important target group is women. As the University of California prepares and implements its graduate and professional student affirmative action plan, thorough consideration should be given to the educational needs of women, as well as those of ethnic minority and low-income students.

FOOTNOTES

1/ Student Affirmative Action Plan for the California Community Colleges, as adopted by the Board of Governors, February 1979, Sacramento, California, page 51.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council on Education and Association of American Law Schools. *The Bakke Decision: Implications for Higher Education Admissions*. Washington, D.C.: 1978.

American Institute for Research. *Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program*. Prepared for Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: March 1978.

Benokraitis, Nijole V., and Joe R. Feagin. *Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity: Action, Inaction and Reaction*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1978.

Burnett, Robert W. *National Estimates of Bilingual Education Teachers*. (paper prepared for the American Educational Research Association). SRI International: April 1979.

California Community Colleges. *Community College Child Development Programs and Services*. Office of the Chancellor: April 1978.

California Community Colleges. *Student Affirmative Action Plan for the California Community Colleges*.

California Department of Finance. Population Research Unit. *Population Estimates for California Counties*. Sacramento: December 1978.

California Department of Finance. *Population Estimates for California Counties: Advance Report*. Report 78 E-Z. Sacramento: December 1978.

California School Boards Association. *District Survey 1977-78*. Sacramento: July 1978.

California State Board of Education. *Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics for Low-Achieving Students, 1977-78*. A report to the California Legislature. Sacramento: 1979.

California State Board of Education. *Plans to Alleviate Racial and Ethnic Segregation of Minority Students* (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Sections 90-101). Sacramento: April 12, 1978.

California State Department of Education. *Annual Report on Publicly Subsidized Child Care Services*. Sacramento: 1978.

California State Department of Education. *Bilingual Education Programs in California, 1975-76*. Sacramento: 1977.

California State Department of Education. *Bilingual Education Services Guide - Developing School Site Programs: LES/NES Specifications*. Sacramento: April 1978.

California State Department of Education. *The Bilingual Teacher Corps Program 1977-78*. Sacramento: 1979.

California State Department of Education. *Child Care and Development Services: Report of the Commission to Formulate a State Plan for Child Care and Development Services in California, 1978*. Sacramento: 1979.

California State Department of Education. *Comprehensive Report on Bilingual-Crosscultural Teacher Education*. Sacramento: 1978.

California State Department of Education. *Education for Limited English and Non-English Speaking Students, Part I*. Sacramento: April 1978.

California State Department of Education. *Education for Limited English Speaking and Non-English Speaking Students, Part II*. Sacramento: July 1978.

California State Department of Education. *Interagency Task Force on Bilingual Teacher Preparation Report*. Sacramento: November 1978.

California State Department of Education. *Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Students and Staff in California Public Schools, Fall 1977*. Sacramento: 1978.

California State Department of Education. *Selection and Retention of Students in California Institutions of Higher Education*. Sacramento: 1961.

California State University and Colleges. *An Evaluation of Selected Areas of EOP Student Achievement and Support Services*. Long Beach: May 1978.

California State University and Colleges. *A Framework for Student Affirmative Action in the California State University and Colleges*. Long Beach: December 1978.

California State University and Colleges. Report of the Child Care Study Committee. Long Beach: September 1978.

California State University and Colleges. Those Who Stay--Phase II: Student Continuance in the California State University and Colleges. Long Beach: May 1979.

California State University and Colleges. Those Who Stay--Phase II: Student Continuance in the California State University and Colleges. Technical Memorandum Number 8, Division of Institutional Research: May 1979.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Next Steps for the 1980s in Student Financial Aid: A Fourth Alternative. Berkeley: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1979.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Selective Admissions in Higher Education: Comment and Recommendations and Two Reports. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

The College Board. Beyond Desegregation. New York: 1978.

College Scholarship Service. Making It Count: A Report on a Project to Provide Better Financial Aid Information to Students. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1976.

Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Report on the Supply and Demand For Bilingual Teachers in School Districts in California. Sacramento: September 1978.

Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Status Report on Bilingual-Cross-Cultural Teacher Preparation in Accordance with California Education Code Section 10101. Sacramento: February 1978.

Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Status Report on Bilingual-Cross-Cultural Teacher Preparation in Accordance with California Education Code Section 10101. Sacramento: February 1979.

Education Commission of the States and the Justice Program of the Aspen Institute. Bakke and Beyond (Report No. 112). Denver, Colorado: July 1978.

Espinoza, Ruben W. and Joseph O. Garcia. Credentialed Staff--Pupil Ratios by Ethnicity in the California Public Schools. San Diego State University: December 1976.

Federal Register. Volume 24, No. 100, Title 45, Chapter 1, Part 159.1. May 24, 1977.

Gappa, Judith M., and Barbara S. Uehling. *Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality*. 1979.

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. *Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education: An Assessment*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976.

Kissler, Gerald. *Demographic and Enrollment Trends* (presentation at UC Irvine Conference on Access to Higher Education). Irvine: March 1979.

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. *Quarterly Bulletin*. Los Angeles: Selected issues 1973-78.

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning. Population and Human Resources Section. *Racial and Ethnic Population Groups Within the Cities and Unincorporated Places in Los Angeles County, April 1970*. Los Angeles: 1970

Los Angeles Department of City Planning. *October 1977 Estimate of Population by Race*. Los Angeles: August 1978.

Luna, Peter Reynoso. *Evaluation of a Higher Education Entry Program for Low-Income and Monority Students and Application of a Systems Approach to Future Planning*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Xerox University Films, 1974.

Marquis Academic Media. *Sourcebook of Equal Educational Opportunity*. Chicago: Marquis Who's Who, Inc., 1977.

Moore, Kathryn, and Helen C. Veres. *A Study of Two-Year College Women in Central New York State: Characteristics, Career Determinants, and Perceptions*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education, 1975.

National Board on Graduate Education. *Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education*. A Report with Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: Number 5, June 1976.

National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities. *Federal Student Assistance and Categorical Programs*. Washington, D.C.: January 1979.

Open Road Issues Research. *Lost in the Shuffle*. 1979.

Research Triangle Institute. *Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A First Follow-Up*. North Carolina: September 1977.

Rose, Clare, and Glenn F. Nyre. *Access and Assistance: The Study of EOP/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education*. Evaluation and Training Institute.

Salazar, Leonard J. and S.V. Martorana. *State Postsecondary Education Planning (1202) Commissions: A First Look*. Center for the Study of Higher Education. Pennsylvania State University: June 1978.

State of California. *Governor's Budget, 1979-80*. Sacramento: 1979.

System Development Corporation. "A Study of Special Services for Disadvantaged Students." Santa Monica.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Language Usage in the United States: July 1975*. Washington, D.C.: July 1976.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States: March 1976*. Washington, D.C.: November 1976.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *The Unfinished Education: Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States*. Mexican American Educational Series, Report II. October 1971.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. *Bilingual Education: An Unmet Need*. Office of the U.S. Comptroller General: May 1976.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. *The Educational Disadvantage of Language Minority Persons in the United States, Spring 1976*. Washington, D.C.: July 1978.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. Bulletin. *Geographic Distribution, Nativity, and Age Distributions of Language Minorities in the United States, Spring 1976*. Washington, D.C.: August 1978.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. *Place of Birth and Language Characteristics of Persons of Hispanic Origin in the United States, Spring 1976*. Washington, D.C.: October 1978.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Survey of Income and Education*. Washington, D.C.: July 1976.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Violent Schools--Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress*. Washington, D.C.: January 1978.

U.S. Department of Labor. *Children of Working Mothers, 1978*. Washington, D.C.: 1978.

University of California. *Beyond High School Graduation: Who Goes to College?* University of California: Office of Outreach Services, May 1978.

University of California. *Child Care Survey*. University Systemwide Administration: 1979.

University of California. *A Report of the President's Task Force on Chicanos and the University of California*. University Systemwide Administration: July 1975.

University of California. *Report of the University of California Educational Opportunity Programs, 1973-74*. Office of the President: March 5, 1975.

University of California. *University of California Student Affirmative Action Plan*. University Systemwide Administration: May 1978.

University of California. *The University of California's Partnership Program--The First 18 Months*. University Systemwide Administration: February 1978.

University of California, Irvine. *Evaluation of Early Outreach Partnership Program--Final Report*. University of California, Irvine: Office of Relations with Schools and Colleges, Educational Opportunity Program, June 1979.

Westervelt, Esther. *Barriers to Women's Participation in Postsecondary Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Zappert, Larraine Testa; Roberto Cruz. *Bilingual Education--An Appraisal of Empirical Research*. Berkeley Unified School District: 1977.